













N 485-186

THE  
EDINBURGH REVIEW,  
OR  
*CRITICAL JOURNAL:*

FOR  
JULY, 1851 . . . . OCTOBER, 1851.

*TO BE CONTINUED QUARTERLY.*

---

---

*IUDEX DAMNATUR CUM NOCENS ABSOLVITUR.*

*PUBLIUS SYRUS.*

---

---

VOL. XCIV.

LONGMAN, BROWN, GREEN, AND LONGMANS, LONDON;  
AND ADAM AND CHARLES BLACK,  
EDINBURGH.

---

1851.

OS 2 E DJ

Vol. 94 (Pt. 2)

Cop. 2

Uttarpore J. Public Library

Acqn. No. 6529 Date... 1/4/75

LONDON:

SPOTTISWOODES and SHAW,  
New-street-Square.

THE  
EDINBURGH REVIEW,

OCTOBER, 1851.

---

N<sup>o</sup>. CXCII.

---

ART. I. — *A Comparative Grammar of the Sanskrit, Zend, Greek, Latin, Lithuanian, Gothic, German, and Slavonic Languages.* By Professor F. BOPP. Translated from the German principally by Lieutenant EASTWICK, M.R.A. Conducted through the Press by H. H. WILSON, M.A., F.R.S., Boden Professor of Sanskrit in the University of Oxford. London: 1845-50.

‘COMPARATIVE PHILOLOGY’ is a science of very modern date. It cannot trace its lineage much higher than the beginning of the present century, and it is scarcely received as yet on a footing of equality by the elder branches of learning. Classical Philology, in particular, as if afraid of the charms of a younger sister, has for a long time treated Comparative Philology with a kind of supercilious pride, and in several cases the hostile feeling of the two rivals has vented itself in open feuds and quarrels. Comparative Philology has, however, maintained its ground successfully against the prejudices and jealousies which every thing new has to contend with. It has attracted the attention of men of the highest rank in other branches of learning, and the author of ‘Kosmos’\* reckons its results

---

\* ‘Languages, compared with each other, and considered as objects of the natural history of the human mind, being divided into families according to the analogy of their internal structure, have become — (and it is one of the most brilliant results of modern studies in the last sixty or seventy years) — a rich source of historical knowledge.

among the most brilliant fruits of modern research. Classical scholars also begin to acknowledge the importance of this new science. *Otfried Müller*, the celebrated author of the 'Dorians,' was one of the first to appreciate fully the value of the new discoveries which had been made in the field of language. 'Matters have come to that point,' he says, 'that Classical Philology must either resign altogether the historical understanding of the growth of language as well as all etymological researches into the shape of roots and the organisation of grammatical formations, or trust itself on these points entirely to the guidance and counsel of Comparative Philology.' The old system of etymology, if system it can be called, in which, as *Voltaire* remarked, 'la voyelle ne fait rien, et la consonne fort peu de chose,' has certainly been stopped effectually by the introduction of comparative grammar. Its principles have been stated and carried out in a number of works, full of erudition and ingenuity, particularly in Germany, where it is taught at present in every university. All this we consider a fair proof of the solidity and genuineness of Comparative Philology, and although it is still very far from having arrived at full maturity, yet it must be admitted that it has fairly come of age.

The name which it has assumed shows at once the comprehensive character of this new science. In the same way as Comparative Anatomy comprises not only the anatomy of the human body, but of all organic beings, Comparative Philology does not restrict itself to Greek and Latin, but includes all

---

Products of the mental power, they lead us back, by the fundamental characters of their organisation, to an obscure and otherwise unknown distance. The comparative study of languages shows how races or nations, now separated by wide regions, are related to each other, and have proceeded from a common seat; it discloses the direction and the path of ancient migrations; in tracing out epochs of development it recognises in the more or less altered characters of the language, in the permanency of certain forms, or in the already advanced departure from them, which portion of the race has preserved a language nearest to that of their former common dwelling-place. The long chain of the Indo-European languages, from the Ganges to the Iberian extremity of Europe, from Sicily to the North Cape, furnishes a large field for investigations of this nature into the first or most ancient condition of language. The same historical comparison of languages leads us to trace the native country of certain productions, which, since the earliest times, have been imported objects of trade and barter. We find that the Sanskrit names of true Indian productions — rice, cotton, nard, and sugar, — have passed into Greek, and partly into the Semitic languages.' — *HUMBOLDT, Kosmos*, vol. ii.

languages spoken by man. Its first task, therefore, consists in collecting as large a mass of material as possible. Specimens of human speech, whether derived from the masterworks of Greek and Latin authors, or from the clucking utterance of Bojesmans, from the Steppes and the Prairies, from the tombs of Egypt, or the Runes of Iceland, and the mountain records of Persia—all are equally welcome to the Comparative Philologist. Wherever commercial enterprise, warlike expeditions, or the pious labours of Christian missionaries open an unexplored field for natural sciences, Comparative Philology follows in their track, and avails itself of every newly discovered specimen of human speech. Its limits are as wide as the limits of the habitable world.

Yet it must not be supposed that the peculiar character of Comparative Philology consists in the mere work of accumulating languages. The late Cardinal *Mezzofanti*, who spoke about thirty languages, was not therefore a Comparative Philologist. The difference between Philology, whether classical or Oriental, and Comparative Philology is more essential. Classical as well as Oriental Philology considers language merely as a key to an understanding of the written documents which antiquity has bequeathed to us; as a spell to raise from the tomb of time the thoughts of great men in different ages and countries, and as a means ultimately to trace the political, intellectual, and moral progress of mankind. Although the study of grammar is a *conditio sine quâ non* with every scholar, yet the highest aim of a Greek or Latin grammar does not go farther than a thorough knowledge of the laws and peculiarities of the Greek and Roman tongue, as they have been preserved to us in the classics. Comparative Philology, on the contrary, uses the literary remains of all nations as a means to arrive at an understanding of the nature and laws of language. Language itself becomes the object of inquiry. If we consider the immense number of tongues which are spoken in the different parts of the world, with all their dialectic and provincial varieties, if we observe the great changes which each of these languages has undergone in the course of centuries, we see that language has, like man, a history of its own. Without studying this history, and analysing the forms of language in their local variety and historical progress, it is impossible to form any correct and distinct idea of the real nature of language. For if we did not know by experience, that there existed a large number of different idioms, would it not be the most natural supposition that the language of mankind should be the same in all climates? If speech is a faculty, planted in the inmost nature of man,—

if it is connected with man as intimately as the reasoning faculties of the mind, or the perceptive faculties of the senses, why should the one be subject to historical and local changes, while the other remains unaltered in all times and countries? We see and hear everything around us in the same way as the nations of Africa and America, and if we try to reason with savages, on things familiar to them, we find that their logic is exactly the same as our own. The only difference between them and ourselves consists in a higher or lower degree of cultivation, in a more or less skilful use of the organs of body and mind. Yet there is not one word in their languages which expresses the same idea by the same sound as we do.

Even if this variety of languages be explained by the admission of an early confusion of tongues, or taken for granted like any other fact of natural history, we certainly should not suppose, unless we had the historical documents of earlier ages before us, that one and the same language could become so different, in the course of time, as the language of Shakspeare is from that of Alfred the Great, the language of Dante from that of Cicero, the language of Göthe from that of Charlemagne: and, we may add, if we accept the views of Comparative Philology, the language of the 'Times' from that of the 'Veda.' The notes of the nightingale, though different from those of the lark, are the same to-day as they were thousands of years ago—why should the language of men have changed? We may see three or four generations living together, and we always find that the great-grandfather understands the stammering of his great-grandson. Who would imagine then, that after thirty generations a language could change so much as to become apparently quite a different one? Yet such is the case if we compare the language of St. Augustin, in the fifth century, with that of Dante at the beginning of the fourteenth.

It is clear, therefore, that the nature of language cannot be studied either in the abstract or by means of but one of its numerous varieties, like our own language, but that an historical method alone can lead to satisfactory results. In order to know, for instance, how English came to be what it is at present, it is necessary to study all the languages which have either influenced it, or materially contributed towards its formation. It is principally from the Anglo-Saxon and Norman that the history of the English 'speech' must be studied, but a knowledge of the Old Teutonic, the Scandinavian, the Latin, and Celtic languages is not less essential.

The *Romance languages* are in this respect the most interesting, because we can here watch the gradual decay of the mother-

stock and the formation of its affiliated dialects, the Provençal and French, the Italian and Walachian, the Spanish and Portuguese. We can see the old forms of the Latin grammar gradually losing their expressive power, and auxiliary words, such as prepositions and articles, coming in to form the new declensions, while the decaying structure of the conjugations is propped up by auxiliary verbs. Some of the old forms linger on for a time, and the new periphrastic expressions are at first used with a certain reserve, but at last the whole structure of modern languages is overgrown by them. The old conjunctions and adverbs give way to more distinct expressions and circumlocutions, and these, by a rapid change, coalesce again into new words. We may be allowed to give a few instances.

The Latin *tunc*, we find still only slightly altered in the old Spanish *estonze* (*ex tuncce*) and in the Walachian *atunci* (*ad tuncce*). But in French and Italian quite a new word has been introduced, which meant originally 'at that hour,' 'ad illam horam,' the Italian *allora*, the French *alors*. The same word '*hora*,' may still be recognised in the Spanish *esora*, *ipsâ horâ*, 'at this very hour,' and in the French and Italian *encore* and *encora*, *i. e.* *hanc horam*, 'at this hour.' The French *désormais*, henceforth, consists of four words, *de-ès-or-mais*, *de ipsâ horâ magis*, 'from this hour,' while the corresponding Spanish *de hoy mas* is a corruption of *de hodie magis*, 'from to-day.' So, again, most of the substantives in the Romance languages are easily derivable from the Latin, particularly if we take into account not only the classical, but also the more vulgar, the middle-age and clerical Latin. The French *menace*, Italian *minaccia*, Spanish *amenaza*, finds its explanation in the Latin *minaciæ*, which Plautus used instead of *minæ*. Cicero says, he does not venture to use the word *medietas* (*bina media*, *vix enim audeo dicere medietates*); yet this is the word which has given rise to the French *moitié*. Words like the French *compagnon*, Ital. *compagno*, Spanish *compañño*, do not find an explanation in the classical Latin, but *companium* is a word furnished by the later Latin, and probably derived from *companis*, a companion, lit. 'one who shares his bread with another.' Words frequently modify not only their form, but their meaning also. In the French *une gêne*, we may still catch a glimpse of the Latin, or rather Hebrew, '*una gehenna*,'\* in *jaloux* of *zelosus*, in *parole* of *parabola*. But there are words and grammatical forms in French which cannot be explained by a mere reference to

---

\* Montaigne in his 'Essais' says, 'Je me suis contraint et gehenné pour maintenir ce vain masque.'—Livres II. chapitre viii.



Latin. If we inquire after the origin of the French future *je chanterai*, we shall find no analogy in Latin, for the theory that it is derived from *cantabo* or *cantavero*, has long been exploded. And again, a word like the French *même*, 'even,' or *moi même*, 'myself,' has no form in Latin corresponding to it.

In these cases it is necessary to apply a different principle. Languages which cannot be explained by themselves, or by the old language out of which they arose, may still be explicable in their new formation by collateral evidence, taken from other tongues which sprang from the same source. Now, as Italian, Spanish, and Portuguese are known to have had the same parentage as French, a reference to them ought to throw light on many obscure points of French grammar, and perhaps furnish the link wanting to connect the French with its parent, the Latin. The Italian Future is *canterò*, which by itself is not much clearer than the French *je chanterai*. But there is an old Italian form *canter-aggio*, the termination of which (*aggio*) is known as a different form of the verb *Io ho*, I have. That the auxiliary verb, 'I have,' was used for the formation of the Future, we learn from the Sardinian, where *appu*, I have, is put before the verb, *appu essi*, *has essi*, *hat essi*, I shall, thou wilt, he will be. It becomes therefore probable that *canterò* also was originally *cantar ho*, I have to sing, I shall sing, and that the Spanish *cantaré*, the Portuguese *canteréi*, as well as the French *je chanterai*, were meant to express the meaning of 'I have to sing,' *j'ai à chanter*. The decisive proof, however, of the correctness of this derivation we receive from the Provençal language, which at times separates the auxiliary verb from the infinitive by a pronoun; as *dar vos n'ai*, 'je vous en donnerai,' *dir vos ai*, 'je vous dirai,' *dir vos em*, 'nous vous dirons,' instead of 'nous avons à vous dire.' This mode of expressing the future once understood, we find an analogy also in Latin phrases, like 'habeo dicere.' As to the French *même*, it can be traced back to the old French *meisme*, and this again is to be compared with the Spanish *mismo*, and the Portuguese *mesmo*. A step farther brings us to the Italian *medesimo*, this to the Provençal *medesme*, and this to the older Provençal from *smetessme*. Knowing that Latin *ipse* becomes changed into *es* in the Romance languages (as *esora* — *ipsû horû*), we have to re-translate the *essme* of *smetessme*, and the *esimo* of *medesimo*, into the Latin *ipsissimus*, and after this *smetessme* scarcely differs from the Latin *semet ipsissimus*, which is the key to the French *même*.

The advantages of this method, as applied to the study of different members of one and the same family of languages, are

evident. It is as if we had before us the diaries of several travellers who all set out on the same journey, but who, according to their individual tastes and characters, noted down the various events in their passage from place to place in a different style and a different spirit. When this collateral evidence is wanting, our knowledge of the historical progress of any single idiom must generally be deficient and uncertain. The Greek language, for instance, which in ancient times exhibits so great a variety of dialectical formations, has come down to us only in one narrow stream, as the modern Greek. In trying to account for the new grammatical forms of this classical idiom, we look in vain for that kind of collateral evidence which the six parallel dialects of the language of Rome offer in such abundance: so that if we cannot explain the new modes of expression by a reference to the old *Koinḗ*, we are left without any further help. Happily the changes which the language of Athens suffered in its transition from the old to the modern Greek, are less considerable by far than those experienced by the Latin during the vicissitudes of its historical and national development. Most of the new grammatical forms can still be recognised by a classical scholar. The declension has been preserved almost entirely the same as in the ancient grammar. The conjugation also contains hardly any new elements. Some forms have gone out of use, as, for instance, the Dative in the declensions, the Dual in declension and conjugation, the Optative, and also, to a great extent, the old Infinitive. There are also some few periphrastic tenses which have found their way into the modern Greek; but they are by no means so perplexing as similar forms in the Romance dialects. Everybody acquainted with the character of secondary formations in language, will understand at once the process by which compound tenses, such as *θέλω γράψει*, I shall write, *ἔχω γράψει*, I have written, *εἶχα γράψει*, I had written, *ἤθελα γράψει*, I should write, have been formed; and, with the exception of foreign words, which may easily be traced back to their original source—the dictionary of the *ῥωμαικὴ γλῶσσα* offers hardly any difficulties.

But if in languages like the modern Greek, we can explain the new formations by comparing them with the ancient types out of which they have sprung, it is evident that this method would altogether fail, if we tried to apply it to an analysis of ancient idioms.

As, generally speaking, we know no Greek before Homer, no Latin before Ennius, no German before Ulphilas, it is impossible to trace the historical formation of these languages farther back. There is no language, or at all events we do not

know it, from which the Greek, Latin, and Gothic, under their oldest forms, could be said to have been derived. The only method of investigation, therefore, which can be applied to these languages, consists in a comparative analysis of cognate idioms, a method which was suggested to us before, in exploring the growth of the modern offshoots of the Latin stock—the Romance dialects. It is true that attempts have been made to derive German from Latin, Latin from Greek, and Greek from Hebrew, yet such theories would scarcely find an advocate in the present century.\* If, therefore, the nature and laws of the old languages which, historically and philosophically, claim the highest importance, are to be explained at all, it can only be done by a comparative analysis of cognate tongues; and this is *the object of Comparative Philology*.

But how is it possible, with this chaotic mass of languages from all parts of the world before us, to say, which are cognate languages, and which are not? Although Comparative Philology may exclude all modern or secondary languages, yet the number of old and primary languages is so large, and the characters of many even of them at first sight, so heterogeneous,

\* The Greek language has always been a rich source for mystical etymologists. We give a few amusing specimens of these derivations in support of a theory, that the whole history of the world from China to Russia is nothing but an allegorical representation of human life:—

*La Chine*, hiatus, de  $\chi α ι ρ ω$ , hisco, représente l'enfant-monde, ouvrant la bouche pour respirer et se nourrir; l'ennui du monde.

*L'Egypte*, activitas resupina;  $Α ι γ υ π τ ι ο ς$ , de  $α ι ζ$ ,  $α ι γ ο ι$ , capra, le grand symbol de la vivacité d'esprit, dans le langage allégorique, et de  $υ π τ ι ο ς$ , resupinus, représente l'enfant-monde au berceau, soumis comme on sait qu'étaient les Egyptiens.

*La Babylonie*, inarticulation des paroles et confusion des pensées; de *baba*, vox inarticulata, et  $β λ ω ν$  de  $β λ η$ , materia, sylvā, symbole des idées croissantes comme des arbres.

*L'Assyrie*, qui avance vers l'ordre et l'arrangement des idées; de  $α σ σ ο ν$ , prope, et  $υ π ι ο ν$ , favus, les cellules hexagones.

*La Médie*, qui commence à méditer en soi-même, à former des desseins; de  $μ η δ ο ς$ , consilium.

*La Perse*, la première jeunesse, fougueuse, emportée; de  $π ε ρ θ ω$ , infinitif actif,  $π ε ρ σ α ι$ , vasto.

*Athènes*, la vigueur florissante;  $α θ ά ρ α$ , immortalitas, de  $α$  privatif, et  $θ ά ρ α ς$ , mors.

*Rome*, la virilité forte et robuste de l'animal-monde.

*La Russie*, les rides de la vieillesse; de  $ρ υ σ σ ο ς$ , rugosus.

that it would be impossible to advance one step towards a scientific solution of the problem in question, without first trying to arrange the whole mass in certain groups or families.

If in the cases mentioned before, we had taken German or English, instead of Italian and Spanish, to explain the formation of the Future in French, we should have found no explanation at all, or probably a wrong one. Yet both these languages are immediately bordering on the French, and both show by their vocables, that they are largely indebted to the Latin, from which the French also is derived. With regard to modern languages, indeed, a knowledge of the political history of the nations by whom they were spoken, is generally sufficient to indicate their genealogical connexion; but we have no such help for classifying the languages of old nations.

This classification had been attempted long before the rise of Comparative Philology, but it had never before been founded on the nature of language itself. Languages had been classified either according to their geographical distribution, (such as the languages of Europe, Asia, Africa, America, and Australia,) or according to the physical races of man by whom they were spoken (such as the Caucasian, Mongolian, Negro and Malay). It was usual also, to speak of sacred and profane, classical and oriental, living and dead languages, but all these divisions were based only on external accidents. By undertaking, for the first time, a classification of languages according to the peculiar character of their etymological and grammatical structure, Comparative Philology has found that tongues, spoken in the most distant regions of the world, and by nations apparently unconnected by any historical intercourse, may yet belong to the same family, while, in other cases, languages, spoken in one and the same district, can be shown to be of a totally different origin. Great results have been obtained in this manner, and other sciences, like Ethnology and History, have largely availed themselves of these new discoveries. Yet, however interesting and important the facts may be, which have been elicited from a comparison of languages, this subject is as yet very far from being exhausted. There are still languages in the world which have never been studied at all. Many others are known only by scanty and often untrustworthy lists of words. And although the characteristic features and broad outlines of several groups have been established by philological research, yet the number of languages which have been subjected to a careful analysis of their grammatical and etymological structure, is comparatively small. It is true that for general purposes, lists of words, when drawn up carefully, are sometimes sufficient, if not

to prove, at least to indicate, the connexion of languages. This process, however, has so frequently been found unsuccessful, that Comparative Philology has altogether discouraged it. It is true also, that as a first attempt a division of languages, according to their general character, may be instructive. Yet by knowing that certain tongues are *monosyllabic*, *agglutinative*, or *inflectional*, we know little more than a scholar of natural history, who has observed, that some animals have two, and others four legs, while some have no legs at all. It is much the same, as if we were to classify men, birds, and whales as bipeds, or eels and serpents as fishes. This is not meant, to deny that terms such as monosyllabic, agglutinative, and inflectional, synthetic and analytic, are very useful and appropriate for a classification of languages. But such terms have a meaning only after languages have been subjected to the most careful analysis, and, so to say, to a microscopic anatomy of their grammar. They mean nothing at all in the mouths of people, who do not know even the alphabets of the very languages which they venture to classify.\* The less we know of lan-

---

\* A striking confirmation of this is offered in a work lately published by Dr. Latham, 'On the Varieties of Man.' This gentleman, to whom we owe already a history of the English language, embodying the results of Grimm's celebrated Teutonic Grammar, has also thought it necessary in his present work to avail himself of the results of Comparative Philology, and to bring them to bear on the natural history of man. But, instead of following Dr. Prichard's excellent work,—'Researches into the Physical History of Man,'—which is by no means antiquated, Dr. Latham has adopted a division of languages which seems to be entirely his own. He divides all the languages of the world into four classes, which he calls *aptotic*, *agglutinate*, *amalgamate*, and *anaptotic*. He admits, however, of only three methods of grammar—the Classical, English, and Chinese. All the languages, dead or living, are referred to one of these classes with astonishing rapidity. There remains but one family of languages, which Dr. Latham considers hypothetical,—the 'Arian' 'Indo-Germans.' Sanskrit is to him a very doubtful language, still more its modern descendants,—Hindi, Bengali, Mahratti, &c. According to him, 'the nation that is at one and the same time Asiatic 'and Indo-Germanic remains to be discovered.' This prejudice against Sanskrit is not peculiar to Dr. Latham. It is, or at all events it was, shared by many who found it troublesome to learn this new language. Sanskrit was called a factitious idiom, concocted by the Brahmins after the expedition of Alexander into India; a theory which Schlegel considers 'as happy as that which would account for 'the Egyptian pyramids as natural crystallisations.' There is another point, however, where Dr. Latham seems to have a fair claim on originality. We must quote his own words, because we might be suspected of misrepresenting his opinions. 'The criticism, or, rather,

guages, the easier, of course it is, to classify them, and to apply to them scientific names in an unscientific manner. But Comparative Philology is not a study for amateurs, and has nothing in common with the premature attempts of those precocious systematisers, who see no difficulty in bringing all the languages of the world under certain categories, although they would find it difficult to translate but one sentence from the idioms, which they have so hastily cast into the crucible.

It is, however, not so much an interest in language itself, which has given rise to these systems, as the pressing importance of other questions, which are more or less dependent on the results of Comparative Philology. Of these, the most remarkable are the problems relating to the early diffusion of nations in times not reached by history, and to the common origin of mankind. It is clear, that as soon as all languages, spoken by man, can be traced back to one common source, it will be in vain to maintain any longer that the physical varieties of man necessitate the admission of an independent origin for each race. It was natural, therefore, that the advocates both of the *monogenetic* and *polygenetic* theory should have tried

‘scepticism,’ he says, ‘which has been extended by others to the ‘Indo-Gangetic languages of Hindostan, is extended by the present ‘writer to the Persian.’ He afterwards maintains, that the language ‘of the arrow-headed inscriptions is Sanskrit.’ Colonel Rawlinson, Burnouf, and Lassen, might have saved themselves their trouble if they had been informed of this before. But Dr. Latham has allowed himself to be misled into a still greater mistake. Colonel Rawlinson, Burnouf, and Lassen have shown, that the Persian branch of the Indo-European stock has preserved, particularly in its oldest literary document, the Zend avesta, ancient forms, which occur in the Veda, but have been modified in the more modern Sanskrit. Dr. Latham, not knowing that the language of the cuneiform inscriptions differs from that of the Veda nearly as much as that of Cicero from Homer, has misunderstood this grammatical observation, and imagines that the language of Darius approaches so much to the Vedic dialect, as to prove that the Veda cannot be older than Darius. The premises are wrong, but still more the conclusion. For if we applied this principle to other facts of Comparative Philology, we might say, because the Lithuanian, as spoken at the present day, approaches so much to the Sanskrit as to possess in its declensions Sanskrit terminations, which have been modified in the other Indo-European idioms; therefore Sanskrit may not be much older than the Lithuanian, which any traveller may still hear spoken in parts of Prussia. But there is a Nemesis in every thing; and in the only instance where Dr. Latham attempts to give an authentic specimen of cuneiform writing every letter stands TOPSY-TURVY.

to support their views by evidence, derived from a comparative study of languages; and it was natural also, that, in their impatience to generalise, they should have anticipated results, where all was still conjectural, or taken for granted whatever in different works on Comparative Philology seemed best to suit their own theories. These great questions, however, must wait for their final solution, until the principal languages shall have all passed through the ordeal of Comparative Grammar. The results of Comparative Philology have always been progressive. Different scholars beginning with a diligent study of the organism of one or two languages, have gone on successively to compare them together, and to point out their essential differences or their radical resemblance. Families of languages have thus been established, and the members belonging to one or the other have continually increased in number. The families which have been traced out in this manner, comprise already most of the principal nations of the world; and an admirable statement of the results, arrived at by the combined labours of English and Continental scholars, may be seen in a paper of the late Dr. Prichard 'On the various Methods of Research which contribute to the Advancement of Ethnology, and on the Relations of that Science to other Branches of Knowledge.' This article, which is incorporated in the Report of the British Association for 1848, is the last word which its lamented author has left on the classification of languages and the varieties of man; and it is remarkable, not only for the vastness and accuracy of its learning, but also for that noble spirit of truthfulness and fairness which pervades all the works of Dr. Prichard. After having enumerated the different languages, belonging to what he calls the Indo-European (Arian), the Ugro-Tatarian \* (Turanian), the Chinese, and Syro-Arabian (Semitic) families, he candidly admits that in several cases the inter-connexion rests on unsatisfactory grounds. This applies in particular to the languages of Africa and America, and to several branches of the Ugro-Tatarian family, under which the Chinese and the Indo-Chinese are ranged by some authors. In fact, as before stated, wherever comparative grammar is least advanced, we find the most vague and changeful ethnological con-

---

\* It is high time that the false spelling of Tartar, instead of Tatar, which is found not only in Dr. Latham's 'Varieties of Man,' but even in Dr. Prichard's works, should be given up. The Tatars have nothing to do with Tartarus and the Titans, but they are called Tata (and Tatan) from a Turanian root, which means to stretch, to draw the bow, to pitch tents, *ri* being the plural termination in the Tungusian languages.

clusions, while languages, whose connexion rests on the firm basis of a grammatical comparison, place the ethnological relation of the nations, by whom they were spoken, beyond all contradiction. Although great progress has been made in a comparative analysis of the Arian or Indo-European, the Polynesian, the Semitic, and some branches of the Ugro-Tatarian family, yet the time for approaching the great problem of the common origin of languages is not yet come. No conclusions on this subject can be drawn from casual points of coincidence or difference, between single members of each family, but only from an inter-comparison of all families, and it will require the labour of centuries before this '*comparison of comparative grammars*' can be carried out. In the mean time, it is worthy of remark, that the scholars, who are best competent to give an opinion as to the final results of Comparative Philology, believe, that all researches are tending more and more to the establishment of the common origin of language. Dr. Prichard concludes his paper, alluded to before, with the following words: 'I may venture to remark that with the increase of knowledge in every direction, we find continually less and less reason for believing that the diversified races of men are separated from each other by insurmountable barriers.' He remarks, that the same is the ultimate conviction of the great author of '*Kosmos*;' and in the course of his paper he points out himself, that some of the barriers, by which families of languages seemed to be insurmountably separated, are already beginning to give way. In connexion with this subject, he alludes to a work by Professor Keyser of Christiania, in which its author endeavours to prove the wide extension of the Iberian people through Western Europe in remote times, and connects them with the Lapponic aborigines of Scandinavia. Nay, Dr. Prichard maintains further, that there are phenomena both in language and history which tend to favour the conjecture, that the Celtic nations (whose connexion with the Indo-European family he was himself the first to point out) were in part of Finnish or Lappish descent, and sprang from a mixture of this race with a tribe of Indo-European origin. And lastly, he refers to *Egypt*, where, as he says, 'it was reserved to a distinguished scholar of the present day (the Chevalier Bunsen), to erect the edifice of the most ancient history of the world, a monument of the intelligence of modern Europe more exalted than the royal pomp of the pyramids.' Now Chevalier Bunsen's great discovery, stated in his own words, is, that 'the Egyptian, and perhaps the African man in general, is a scion of the Asiatic stock, which gradually degenerated into the African type. The Egyptian language attests a unity of blood



‘with the great Aramaic tribes of Asia, whose languages have been comprised under the general expression of Semitic, or the language of the family of Shem; and it is equally connected by identity of origin with those still more numerous and illustrious tribes which occupy now the greatest part of Europe, and may perhaps, alone, or with other families, have a right to be called the family of Japhet (the Indo-European languages).’ According to his view, Egypt is a colony which started from the central plains of Asia, before mankind was divided into the families of Shem and Japhet: the language, therefore, contains the undeveloped type of the Semitic and the Indo-European. This theory (the completion of which we may expect in the last volume of the ‘Egypt’) evidently implies the common origin of the Semitic and Indo-European languages, and would show, ‘that the Egyptologic discoveries give a considerable support to the hypothesis of the original unity of mankind, and of a common origin of all languages on the globe.’ We are most willing to accept these prospective views. But we must, nevertheless, insist on this, that if the method of Comparative Grammar is the only means by which the connexion of languages can be safely and firmly established, we are still very far from a scientific and complete solution of this problem; and that, in its present state, Comparative Philology can neither shake our belief in the unity of mankind, nor, on the other hand, materially confirm it.

We must therefore allow, that, like many other sciences, Comparative Philology is still incomplete, and that its final success will depend on further researches. And as such are being carried on at the present moment with great zeal in different quarters, there is good hope of their finally issuing in a favourable result.

In our remaining space we shall restrict ourselves to that branch of Comparative Philology, which has been brought to a certain degree of completeness and perfection, and where we have before us definite results, which are no longer exposed to the fluctuations of new discoveries,—we mean the languages of the Indo-European or Arian family. This branch is of by far the greatest interest, since it comprises the languages most familiar to ourselves, the principal tongues of Europe, together with those of Asia-Minor, Persia, and India.

Out of a large number of works which have been written on this family of languages, particularly in Germany, we have selected, for the present article, Professor F. Bopp’s Comparative Grammar of the Sanskrit, Zend, Greek, Latin, Lithuanian, Gothic, German, and Slavonic Languages, because it is univer-

sally considered as the classical work on this branch of Comparative Philology.

We have to thank the Earl of Ellesmere, the noble President of the Royal Asiatic Society, for the translation of this important work. It is with him that the design originated. He has borne a share in its execution, and taken a warm and liberal interest in its completion. The main part of the translation devolved on Lieutenant Eastwick, now Professor of Urdu in the East India College at Haileybury: and in the name of Professor H. H. Wilson, who has conducted it through the press, we have the further guarantee, that nothing has been neglected to make it a faithful reproduction of the original. Anybody as yet unacquainted with the nature and principles of Comparative Grammar, and who connects with the latter word certain unpleasant recollections of tiresome hours spent in acquiring the declensions and conjugations of a foreign language, will certainly be rather astonished to hear, that there is such a thing as a grammar of eight languages. We have been told that at one of the London bookshops, Bopp's *New Grammar*, by which eight languages might be learnt at once, has been asked for, together with such happy compendiums as, 'French comparatively in no time,' 'German made easy,' 'Italian without a master.' There is no doubt, however, that the purchaser must have been severely disappointed in his expectations. Comparative Grammar presupposes a knowledge of language, and, so far from giving us a new idiom, it rather teaches us, that we must return to the nursery of knowledge, and endeavour to gain a new acquaintance with our own mother-tongue. Our former instances were taken from the French, but we might just as well have chosen them from our own language. Everybody knows the difference between 'I love' and 'I loved:' but, who could explain, how this change of feeling, which it requires three volumes of a novel, or five acts of a tragedy, to describe, could be expressed by the small and insignificant letter *d*! We know also the very essential difference between a rich man and a richer man, between pound and pounds. But, how a mere *er* should have the power of making a rich man richer, an *s*, of changing a pound into pounds, is a question which probably few have put to themselves, still fewer have answered. Yet, on the whole, the Grammar of the English Language is not a difficult one, nay, we are frequently told, that it has no grammar at all. Our Future, for instance, 'I shall love' is much more distinct and intelligible, in its origin and meaning, than the French *j'aimerai*. But the French *j'aimerai*, is again much easier than the Latin *ama-bo*. And although every schoolboy is able to

conjugate *amare* through all its tenses, moods, and persons, yet there are few classical scholars who could account for the origin and meaning of those mysterious syllables, which have been the fate and the fortune of so many Abelards. Now we have already seen, how the formation of the French language may be explained by a reference to the other Romance languages; and a perusal of Diez's Comparative Grammar will show, that, by a careful analytical comparison, the historical growth of each of these Latin dialects can be explained in all its detail. It will also show, that, in cases where the Latin does not furnish the clue, the older vernaculars, particularly the Provençal, are the most instructive, because they have preserved the growing language in a more transparent and intelligible form. The same applies to the old languages. Forms and words, which are difficult to explain in Latin, find frequently a more intelligible analogue in Greek, and *vice versâ*. In other cases the Lithuanian, Gothic, the old Slavonic dialects, the Persian, and most of all, the Sanskrit, will come in, and throw light on the complicated ramifications of the Arian languages, so much so that in the work before us Professor Bopp could treat eight languages under the form of one grammatical organisation.

Before attempting to follow the learned grammarian into some of his ingenious deductions, we must request the patience of our readers, whilst we give a short outline of the component members of the great Arian family. The first is the *Sanskrit*, with all the different dialects, which have sprung from it in the course of nearly four thousand years. We find the Sanskrit as a fully developed language in the hymns of the *Veda*, at the time when the first Arian settlers immigrated into the north of India. We find it changed already in the laws of *Manu*, and in the epical poems of the *Mahâbhârata* and *Râmâyana*. We see it again, under a different form, in the popular dialects, at the time of the Buddhistic reformation, in the edicts of *As'oka*, carved on the rocks of Kapurdigiri, Dhauli, and Gîrnâr, and in the soft and melodious Prakrit idioms, spoken by the heroines and the inferior characters of the Indian drama. Even in the dialects now spoken all over India, with the exception of the Dekkan, we still recognise the same original language, though deprived of its former richness in form and expression, and depraved by the admixture of foreign elements.

The second branch of the Arian family is the *Persian* language, which may equally be followed, in its historical growth and decay, through different periods of literature. The language of the *Zendavesta*, most intimately connected as it is with the language of the *Veda*, the inscriptions of *Cyrus*, *Darius*, and

*Xerxes*, the *Pázend* or pure Persian, spoken under the Sassanian dynasty, the grand epic poem of *Firdusi*, and the language, now spoken in the country, exhibit a complete biography of the Persian tongue. There are some other scions of the Arian stock which struck root in the soil of Asia, before the Arians reached the shores of Europe; but they are of far less interest, because they do not exhibit in their literature, the gradual progress of a growing language. Although the Armenians may boast of a rich literature, yet we can scarcely speak of a history of the Armenian language in the same sense as of the Sanskrit and Persian.

Another Arian language, the *Ossetic*, has never produced any literature at all, but has been collected only from the mouths of the people, on account of its linguistic importance. This language, spoken in the valleys of Mount Caucasus, and surrounded by tongues of different origin, is one of the most startling phenomena of Comparative Philology. It stands out, like a block of granite errant in the midst of sandstone strata, as a strayed landmark of the migrations of the Arian tribes. So much importance was attributed to this fact, which had first been indicated by Klaproth, that the Berlin Academy sent an expedition to the Caucasus, with the principal object of studying this language. The results of this expedition, as published by Dr. Rosen and Professor Bopp, have proved the connexion of the *Ossetic* with the Arian languages to any one who has but the slightest knowledge of Sanskrit grammar.\*

---

\* We may mention, as a curiosity, that Dr. Latham, without pretending to any knowledge of either Sanskrit or Chinese, and in the face of Dr. Prichard's researches, still expresses 'his belief that the 'Ossetic is more Chinese than Indo-European.' The same author admits, however, that the extension of the Seriform (Chinese) group, so as to include the Caucasian, Georgians, and Circassians, on the one side, and the Indians of Hindostan, on the other, is one of the points for which he is responsible, and which he promises to prove elsewhere. It would be very desirable that in these future articles a proper distinction should be made between the *Ossetic*, on one side, and the Iberian or Circassian languages, on the other. Though geographically united, these two classes of languages require to be treated separately, as much as Celtic and Anglo-Saxon. No one has ever doubted the Indo-Germanic character of the *Ossetic* language; while Professor Bopp's analysis of the Iberian languages, especially the Georgian, has met with much contradiction. For the edification of Chinese scholars, we subjoin some grammatical forms from the *Ossetic*, which they will be astonished to learn 'are more Chinese than Indo-European.' *Staw* in *Ossetic* means to praise; it is the same root as the Sanskrit *stu*, to praise. From this we have,

Much more instructive, however, for an analytic study of the Arian language, is the *Greek*. We have here the particular advantage that various coexistent dialects have happily been preserved to us in their undying literature. We thus gain a most curious insight into the original individuality of the Greek language. Other tongues were once spoken in Asia Minor, and on the borders of Greece, and had their fame in the history of nations. But they have left no written documents, so that we must content ourselves with the scanty fragments, preserved by Greek lexicographers. These are, however, sufficient to prove that Arian blood was running in the veins of some of the most important of these languages, as the Maconian or Lydian, the Cappadocian, the Thracian and Macedonian, while the old Epirotic and Illyrian are considered to be still living in the Skippetarian, Albanian or Arnaut.

Another group of Arian languages has taken possession of Italy. Its principal representative is of course the *Latin*. But a sufficient number of fragments has been preserved, to prove that Italy, fruitful in so much else, was the mother of more than one language. Long before the time of Rome, the Apennine peninsula was peopled by a variety of dialects; and some of them, like the Oscan, were still spoken under the Roman Emperors. It has been shown, that the Umbrian and Oscan were sisters of the Latin; and the languages of Etruria and Messapia, though widely differing from the other Italic dialects, in case their

---

<i>Singular.</i>	<i>Plural.</i>
stawin, <i>I praise.</i>	stawam, <i>we praise.</i>
stawis, <i>thou praisest.</i>	stawut, <i>you praise.</i>
stawi, <i>he praises.</i>	stawinc, <i>they praise.</i>

---

The termination of the Comparative is *der*, in Sanskrit *tara*, Greek *τερος*, Persian *der*.

The declension is Nom. fid, *father*.  
 Gen. fidi, *father's*.  
 Dat. fiden, *father*.  
 Acc. fidéi, *father*.

This language, then, is called *aptotic* by Dr. Latham, aptotic being derived from a=not, and ptosis=case. And if by the application of 'the vaunted laws concerning the permutation and transition of letters,' the termination *am* in stawam, we praise, is compared with *amus* in amamus, *ut* of stawut, you praise, with *atis* in amatis, *inc* in stawinc, they praise, with *ant* in amant; Dr. Latham calls this method philological leger-de-main, and gives vent to complaints as to the retrograde direction of scholarship! Surely there seems to be a falling back from classical scholarship, if in analogy with *aptotic*, without inflection, a word is formed like *ana-ptotic*, which Dr. Latham explains by 'ana= back, and ptosis=a case; falling back from inflexion.'

parentage be ever disclosed, will probably prove of Arian descent. If we add to these, the three great branches, *Teutonic*, *Slavonic*, and *Celtic*, we have before us a tolerably complete list of the members of the Arian family.

It is by itself of no great importance whether this family be called the Arian, or the Japhetic, the Sarmatic, Indo-Germanic, or Indo-European family, as long as we know that all these names are meant to express one and the same idea. Parents, however, quarrel about the names, by which their children are to be christened, and it is not to be wondered at that savans should have done the same. Instead of entering into discussions on the relative merit of each name, it will be more interesting to point out the origin of the title, which we have throughout given to these languages.

'*Arian*' is derived from *árya*, which, as it seems, is the oldest name by which the nations speaking these languages used to call themselves. Traces of this name are found scattered in the most distant quarters of the world, and it is but lately that it has been recognised and adopted for scientific purposes. In the later Sanskrit literature, *árya* means 'of a good family,' 'venerable,' 'a master;' but it is no longer used as a national name, except as applied to the holy land of the Brahmans, which is still called *A'rya-ávarta*, the abode of the A'ryas. In the Veda, however, A'rya occurs very frequently, as a name of honour, reserved to the higher classes, in opposition to the Dasyus, their enemies. For instance, Rigveda, i. 54. 8., 'Know thou the A'ryas, o Indra, and they who are Dasyus; punish the lawless and deliver them unto thy servant! Be thou the mighty helper of the worshipper, and I shall praise all these thy deeds at the festivals.' And again, i. 103. 3., 'Bearing the thunderbolt and trusting in his strength, he strode about rending in pieces the cities of the slaves. Thunderer, thou art wise, hurl thy shaft against the Dasyu; let the power of the A'ryas grow into glory!'

In the later dogmatical literature of the Vedic age, the name of A'rya is distinctly appropriated to the three first castes of the Brahmanic society. Thus we read in the *S'atapatha-bráhmaṇa*. 'A'ryas are only the Brahmans, Kshatriyas, and Vais'yas, for they are admitted to the sacrifices. They shall not speak with everybody, for the gods did not speak with everybody, but only with the Brahman, the Kshatriya, and the Vais'ya. If they should fall into a conversation with a S'údra, let them say to another man, "tell this S'údra so." This is the law for an initiated man.' But while this old name 'A'rya' fell afterwards into oblivion amongst the Hindús, it was more faithfully preserved by the Medians and Persians.

In the Zendavesta, the first created and holy land is called *Airyaném varjo*, 'the source of the Arians,' and this name was in later times transferred to Media, a country too far west to be mentioned in the Zendavesta. Herodotus was told in his Oriental travels, that the Medians originally called themselves *Ἀριοι*, and Hellenicus' gives *Aria* as a synonyme of *Persia*. And now, that we can read, thanks to the wonderful discoveries of Rawlinson, Burnouf, and Lassen, the same records from which Herodotus derived his information, we find Darius calling himself in the cuneiform inscriptions, 'a Persian, the son of a Persian, an Arian, and of Arian descent.' And when, after centuries of foreign invasions and occupation, the Persian empire rose again to historical importance under the Sassanian sway, we find their kings also calling themselves in the inscriptions, decyphered by De Sacy, 'Kings of the Arian and un-Arian races.' (*Irán va Anirán, Ἀριάνων καὶ Ἀναριάνων*). This is the origin of the modern name of *Iran*. Again in the mountains of the Caucasus, we find an Arian race, the *Ossetes*, calling themselves *Irón*, and a tribe of *Arü* was known to Tacitus in the forests of Germany. Here then we have the faint echoes of a name, which once sounded through the valleys of the Himálaya; and it seems but natural, that Comparative Philology, which first succeeded in tracing the common origin of all the nations, enumerated before, should have selected this old and venerable title for their common appellation.

It must not be supposed that Professor Bopp was the first who discovered the connexion of the Arian languages. The close relationship which the ancient vernacular of India bears to Greek and Latin, did not escape the eye of our ingenious Oriental scholar, Sir William Jones, who was the first to point out the wonderful structure of the Sanskrit. He said, at once, 'that the old sacred language of India was more perfect than the Greek, more copious than the Latin, and more exquisitely refined than either—yet bearing to both of them a stronger affinity, both in the roots of the verbs and in the forms of grammar, than could possibly have been produced by accident; so strong, indeed, that no philologist could examine them all three, without believing them to have sprung from some common source, which, perhaps, no longer exists. There is a similar reason, though not quite so forcible, for supposing that both the Gothic and the Celtic, though blended with a very different idiom, had the same origin with the Sanskrit. The old Persian may be added to the same family.' We may observe, also, that the three founders of Sanskrit philology in England—Colebrooke, Prinsep, and Wilson—were, from the first, aware of this affinity. A comprehensive view of

the close relationship of the Germanic and classical languages had been previously given by *Rask* in his valuable prize treatise 'On the Thracian Tribe of Languages.' The same scholar, who himself travelled across the Caucasus to Persia and India, and brought back with him the most valuable MSS. of the Zendavesta, was the first to establish, on a safe ground, the common origin of the Sanskrit and the old Persian; and in a letter of his, written from Petersburg, in May, 1819, we find a classification of languages, where the Sarmatic, *i. e.* the Arian race, is stated to comprehend the Indian, Median, Thracian, Lithuanian, Slavonic, Gothic, and Celtic. Professor Bopp himself acknowledges this. But at the same time he observes\*, that Rask 'halts almost everywhere half-way towards the truth, because he had no knowledge of Sanskrit.' Rask's works on the classification and comparison of languages are, indeed, the best specimen of what could be accomplished in Comparative Philology without the aid of Sanskrit. Rask is learned, ingenious, and bold; yet, compared with Bopp, he is like a sailor without a compass. The discovery of the Sanskrit, and its application to grammatical comparison, form quite a new era in the history of languages, in the same way as the discovery of the loadstone, and its application by the sailors of the Mediterranean, form a most important epoch in the history of navigation. As soon as the Sanskrit appeared above the horizon, the broad fact of the connexion of the Arian languages became as clear as daylight; and we should entirely misapprehend the purpose of Bopp's Comparative Grammar, if we thought that its object was to prove the common origin of the Arian languages. 'The establishment of a connexion of languages,' he says himself, 'was not so much a final object with me as the means of penetrating into the secrets of lingual development; since languages, which were originally one, but during thousands of years have been guided by their own individual destiny, mutually clear up and complete one another, inasmuch as one in this place, another in that, has preserved the original organisation in a more healthy and sound condition. Most European languages, in fact, do not need proof of their relationship to the Sanskrit; for they themselves show it by their forms, which, in part, are but very little changed. But that which remained for philology to do, and which I have endeavoured to the utmost of my ability to effect, was to trace, on one hand, the resemblances into the most retired corner of the construction of language; and, on the other hand, as far as possible, to refer the greater or less

---

\* Bopp's 'Comparative Grammar,' transl. by Eastwick, Preface p. viii.



'discrepancies to laws through which they become possible or necessary.'

In all these researches Sanskrit is the principal and safest guide, because, in general, it is more complete, more distinct, or, as Professor Bopp calls it, more *organic*, in its structure than the other Arian languages. Yet the other Arian languages can by no means be considered as derived from the Sanskrit, or as standing to it in the same relation in which the Romance languages stand to the Latin. Although the Sanskrit of the Veda is, even chronologically, older than either the Greek of Homer or the Persian of Cyrus; yet, as far as relationship goes, it is only the eldest sister, and holds, with regard to the other cognate tongues, exactly the same position in which the Provençal stands to the Romance languages. This is evidently the opinion of Professor Bopp, although he has more than once been accused of 'believing too much in the imaginary inviolability and pristine fidelity and perfection of the Sanskrit.'

The first part of the Comparative Grammar is devoted to the phonetic system of the Arian languages. After giving an explanation of the principal Arian alphabets, Professor Bopp tries to find which letters in any one language correspond to certain letters in another. The laws of the interchange of letters are arrived at by a comparison of words whose identity cannot be doubted. Safe coincidences, for instance, may be looked for in the numerals of the Arian languages. If we compare Latin *quatuor* with Sanskrit *chatvar*, four, we learn that Sanskrit *ch* can be represented by Latin *qu*. If we compare Latin *quinque* with the Sanskrit *pancha*, five, we find that Sanskrit *p* can be represented by Latin *qu*. Knowing, therefore, these letters to be interchangeable, we can now also identify the Sanskrit *pach*, 'to cook,' with Latin '*coquo*.' Again, as Sanskrit *chatvar* corresponds to the Attic τέσσαρ or τέτταρ, for which we have also the Æolic πίτυρ (Oscan *petur*), we may compare the Greek πέπτω with Sanskrit *pach*, to cook. And, as

coquo=pach, and πέπτω=pach,  
∴ coquo=πέπτω.

If Sanskrit *das'a*, ten, corresponds to Greek *δέκα*, and Latin *decem*, Sanskrit *as'va*, horse, becomes identified with *equus*; the Sanskrit *s'van* (genit. *s'unas*), 'dog,' with Greek *κύων*, and Latin *canis*. These phonetic coincidences and the etymological results based on them, have been worked out by different scholars, particularly by Pott, in his 'Etymologische Forschungen.' Amongst others, the late Dr. Rosen was the first to point out that Sanskrit *ksh* corresponds with Greek *κρ*, and Latin *cr*; for instance, S. *kshatra*, 'power,' = *κράτος*; S. *kshipra*, 'quick,' = *κραιπνός*;

S. *kshura*, 'hoof,' = Latin *crus*. On this he founds afterwards the identification of the Vedic *urukshaya*, wide-ruling, with the Homeric *εὐρυκρείων*. These comparisons, however, have sometimes been carried too far. Because one letter corresponds to another in words whose common origin is certain, it does not follow that it does so always. Professor Bopp identifies, for instance, the Bengali *bohini*, sister, with the Sanskrit *svasār* (the Latin *soror*, Gothic *svistar*), by means of the following process: — 'The initial *s* is rejected, and the second corrupted to *h*. The Sanskrit *v* is, in Bengali, regularly pronounced as *b*, and *a* like *o*. As regards the termination *ini*, I look upon the *i* as an interposed conjunctive vowel, and the *n* as a corruption of *r*, as in the numeral *tin*, three. Properly speaking, *bohini* presupposes a Sanskrit *svasrī* from *sva-stri*.' Now, although we have no doubt that Professor Bopp has analogies for all these changes, yet this process reminds us a little of the old etymology of 'fox,' which was 'alopex (ἀλώπηξ), lopex, opex, pex, pax, pox, and fox.' The fact is, that the Bengali *bohini*, 'sister,' is simply the Sanskrit *bhagini*, 'sister.' On the other hand, the systematic regularity — the almost absolute certainty — to which the phonetic laws of different languages can be brought, may be seen from what is generally called Grimm's Law, on the transposition of sounds (Lautverschiebung). According to this law, which is based on the most minute observations, and which helps, as Grimm expresses himself, to break in wild and vicious etymologies,

1. Greek (and generally Sanskrit, Latin, and Lithuanian) P, corresponds with Gothic PH (f), and Old High German B (v, f).
2. " B, " " " PH (f)
3. " PH (f, φ), " " " P.
4. " T, " " " TH, " " " D.
5. " D, " " " T, " " " TH (z).
6. " TH (f), " " " D, " " " T.
7. " K (c), " " " KH (h, g), " " " G (h).
8. " G, " " " K, " " " KH (ch).
9. " KH (h, χ), " " " G, " " " K.

#### EXAMPLES.

Sanskrit.	Greek.	Latin.	Gothic.	Old High German.
I. pād, pādas (foot).	πούς, ποδός.	pes, pedis.	fōtus.	vuoz.
pitar (father).	πατήρ.	pater.	fadrein.	vatar.
upari (over).	ὑπέρ.	super.	ufar.	ubar.
II. s'ana-bisa (hemp-fibres).	κάνναβις.	cannabis.	* . . . .	hanaf.
bāla (young).	. . . .	pullus.	. . . .	folo.
. . . .	. . . .	turba.	thaurf.	dorf.
III. bhar (to bear).	φέρω.	fero.	baira.	piru.
kapāla or kakubh (head).	κεφαλή.	caput.	haubith.	houpit.
nabhas (air, cloud).	νέφος.	nebula.	nibls.	nepal.
IV. tvam (thou).	σύ.	tu.	thu.	du.
trayas (three).	τρεῖς.	tres.	threis.	dri.
antara (other).	ἕτερος.	alter.	anthar.	andar.

	Sanskrit.	Greek.	Latin.	Gothic.	Old High German.
V.	dvaṇ (two).	δύω.	duo.	tva.	zuei.
	'asru (tear).	δάκρυ.	lacry ma.	tagr.	zahar.
	Dyaus, divas (sky).	Ζεὺς, Δίας.	Dies-(piter).	Tius.	Zio.
VI.	duhitar (daughter).	δουγάρη.	...	dauhitar.	tohtar.
	dhē (to suckle).	διδω, διηλθή.	fe mina.	daddyan.	taan.
	dvar (door).	δίρα.	fores.	daur.	tor.
VII.	hrid (heart).	καρδία.	cor, cordis.	hairto.	herza.
	pas'u (cattle).	πῶν.	pecus.	faihu.*	vihu.
	svas'ura (father-in-law).	ἐκυρός.	socer.	svaihra.	suchur.
VIII.	jānu (knee).	γόνυ.	genu.	kuni.	chuni.
	jnā (to know).	γινώμ.	guosco.	kan.	chan.
	mahat (great).	μέγας.	magnus.	miki's.	mihil.
IX.	hansa (goose).	χήν.	anser.	gans.	kans.
	hjas (yesterday).	χθές.	heri.	gistra.	ke star.
	lih (to lick).	λείχω.	lingo.	laigo.	lekoni.

After some explanations on the roots of words, Professor Bopp goes on to a detailed analysis of the declensions. He distinguishes most carefully, in every word, between the root, the formative or derivative suffix, and the termination of the cases, and shows how all the Arian languages have employed the same elements for expressing the different relations of substantives to substantives and to verbs. Instead of following him into this minute analysis, where often many pages are devoted to one single letter, we shall give one instance, which will show the affinity of the Sanskrit declensions with those of the classical languages and the Gothic, without requiring long expositions as to the changes and losses of letters.

## Singular.

	Sanskrit.	Zend.	Latin.	Greek †	Gothic.
Nom.	bhrātā (brother).	brāta.	frater.	πατήρ.	brōthar.
Gen.	bhrātur'.	brātar-s.	fratr-is.	πατρ-ός	brōthr-s.
Dat.	bhrātr-ē.	brāthr-ē.	fratr-i(Loc.)	πατρ-ί (loc.)	See <i>Inst.</i>
Acc.	bhrātār-am.	brātar-ēm.	fratr-em.	πατρ-α (v.)	brōthar.
Ab.	bhrātur' (gen.)	bhrāthr-aṭ.	fratr-e(d).	....	....
Inst.	bhrātr-ā.	brāthr-a.	....	....	brōthr.
Loc.	bhrātar-i.	brāthr-i.	fratr-i(Dat.)	πατρ-ί (Dat.)	
Voc.	bhrātar.	brātarē.	frater	πάτερ.	

## Plural.

	Sanskrit.	Zend.	Latin.	Greek †
Nom.	bhrātar-as.	brātar-o.	fratr-es.	πατέρ-es.
Gen.	bhrātṛi-n-ām.	brāthr-am.	fratr-um.	πατέρ-ων.
D. & Ab.	bhrātṛi-bhyas.	brātarē-byo.	fratr-i-bus.	πατέρ-σι (Loc.)
Acc.	bhrātṛi-n(ē).	brāthr-ens.	fratr-es.	πατέρ-as.
Inst.	bhrātṛi-bhis.	brātarē-bis.	....	....
Loc.	bhrātṛi-shu.	....	....	πατέρ-σι (Dat.)

\* From this our word fee, pecu-nia.

† As the Greek language has lost the common Arian word for brother (φράτηρ), it was necessary to take πατήρ as the Greek paradigm. It is very characteristic of the genius of the Greek language, that the old word (bhrātār) is not used there in the sense of brother. There can be little doubt that the Greeks knew this common Arian word, for the Homeric φρήρα is clearly derived

The first volume of the Comparative Grammar further comprises the Adjectives, the Degrees of Comparison, and the Numerals. The numerals form a most interesting page of Comparative Philology. Their general similarity in the Arian languages, with a few exceptions in the words for 'one' and 'nine,' is too striking to admit of any doubt with regard to their common origin. It is true that, in some cases, these words, which have been in continual use for the last four thousand years, passing from mouth to mouth in the transactions of daily life, have almost lost their original stamp, and, like old coins, require an experienced eye to recognise them. In most cases, however, they have resisted most wonderfully the wear and tear of centuries. It is not unlikely that several Arian numerals go back as far as the times when the Arian and Semitic families were not yet separated; and, in this case, it would follow, according to Chevalier Bunsen's before-mentioned theory, that the old Egyptian language of the hieroglyphics ought to have the same, or even an older form. This seems, indeed, to be borne out by a comparison of the Egyptian *saf-χ*, 'seven,' on the Arian side, with Sanskrit *sap-ta*, Zend *haptan*,

from it. But the Greeks must very early have extended the ties of brotherhood from the exclusiveness of family life, to the broader range of political society. There were brothers-in-arms, brothers in warlike expeditions; brothers, not as born of the same mother, but as men whose common mother was their common country: they were to each other real *φρατέρες*, *fratres*, companions and friends. Now, if *φρατήρ* had once taken the meaning of clansman, brother-in-arms, it was no longer fit to express the particular relation between children of the same parents, and therefore another word was coined for this meaning, — *ἀδελφός* (for *ἀμυδελφος*), — corresponding to the Latin *co-uterinus*, and the Sanskrit *sa-garbha*, *i. e.* of the same womb. This way of accounting for the absence of the word *φρατήρ*, in Greek, is most strikingly confirmed by a reference to the modern languages. The laws which affect the growth of language are the same in ancient and modern idioms. But in modern languages the process of formation is almost historical, — we can prove it by documents, and trace it from century to century; while in the ancient languages we must begin with conjectures, and try to confirm them by critical research. Now, why has the old Latin word for brother, which the French has preserved in *frère*, been lost in Italian and Spanish? — Because in Spain and Italy the classical word, *frater*, took so entirely the technical sense of 'a brother of a religious order,' — a monk (*friar*), that the Italian *frate* and *fra*, as well as the Spanish *frej* (*freile*, *fray*, *fraille*), could no longer be used for brother in its original sense, and had to be replaced by *fratello* and *hermano*. The same accounts for the substitution of *sorella* for the Italian *suora*, and of *hermana* for the Spanish *sor*.

Greek *ἐπτά*, Latin *septem*, Gothic *sib-un*: and, on the Semitic side, with Hebrew *shib-xáh*, Ethiopic *sabáxe-tu*, and Arabic *sabatun*, which explains the Hebrew *Sabath*, 'the seventh day of the week.'

The following list will show the similarity of the Arian numerals:—

Sanskrit.	Zend.	Persian.	Greek.	Latin.	Lithuanian.	Slavonic.	Gothic.	Anglo-Saxon.	Welsh.
I. eka.	séva.	yekl.	ἑς.	unus.	wienas.	jedin.	ains.	án.	un.
II. dva.	dva.	du.	δύο.	duo.	du.	dva.	tval.	tvegen.	dau.
III. tri.	thri.	sih.	τρεῖς.	tres.	trys.	tri.	threhs.	thri.	tri.
IV. chatvār.	chathvār.	chehār.	τέσσαρες.	quatuor.	keturi.	tschetyri.	Advor.	feover.	pedwar.
V. panchan.	panchan.	penj.	πέντε.	quinque.	penki.	pyat.	simf.	sif.	pump.
VI. shash.	cavas.	shesh.	ἕξ.	sex.	szezi.	ichest.	saihs.	six.	chwecc.
VII. saptan.	haptan.	heft.	ἑπτὰ.	septem.	septyni.	sodm.	sihun.	scofon.	sauth.
VIII. ashtan.	astan.	hehst.	ὀκτώ.	octo.	astuni.	osm.	ahtau.	ehhta.	wyth.
IX. navan.	navau.	nuh.	ἑννὰ.	novem.	dewyni.	devyat.	nibun.	nigon.	naw.
X. das'an.	das'an.	deh.	δέκα.	decem.	desimt.	desjat.	talhun.	tyn.	deg.

How the difference of form in these words may be accounted for by phonetic laws, can be seen from Professor Bopp's elaborate investigations. Nothing, however, shows better the close relationship of the Arian numerals, than a comparison with the numerals of different families of languages, as may be gathered from the subjoined specimens of Turanian numerals:—

	Finnic.	Lappic.	Hungarian.	Esak.
I.	kel.	akt.	egy.	bat.
II.	kakst.	qwekte.	ketto.	bi.
III.	kolmi.	kolm.	harom.	hiru.
IV.	nelya.	nelye.	negy.	lau.
V.	wisil.	wit.	ot.	bost.
VI.	kuusi.	kot.	hat.	sei.
VII.	seitsen.	kietya.	het.	szapl.
VIII.	kahdeksa.	kaktse.	nyoltz.	yorzi.
IX.	yhdeksa.	akte.	kilents.	bederatsi.
X.	kymmen.	lokke.	tiz.	amar.

How far the identification of the Arian numerals can be carried, appears from this, that even the accent, which has so long been despised as an invention of grammarians, while it is, indeed, the very soul of words, is ascertained to be the same in the Greek and Sanskrit numerals. At the time, when Professor Bopp wrote his Comparative Grammar, it was not yet known that the Sanskrit had preserved its system of accentuation in manuscripts. None of the works written in the so-called classical Sanskrit are accented; and the late Dr. Rosen had not marked the accents in his edition of the first book of the Rig-Veda. The new edition of the Rig-Veda, however, which is now publishing under the patronage of the East India Company, shows that the Vedic literature of the Brahmans is accented; and Professor Bopp promises a supplement to his Comparative Grammar, in order to prove the common origin and true principles of the Sanskrit and Greek accents. The rules on the accent in Sanskrit are contained in the Prātiśākhya, — works which are quoted by the famous Indian grammarian, Pāṇini, and are therefore anterior to the fourth century B.C. They coincide in their general bearing with the Greek

rules.\* In the numerals, for instance, the only two which are oxytona in Greek, are also oxytona in Sanskrit (Sansk. *ashtán* = ὀκτώ, eight, *saptán* = ἑπτά, seven); while *pánchan* = πέντε, *návan* = ἑννέα, *dásan* = δέκα, are paroxytona, both in the Veda and in Homer. This should be a fact of some interest to those who 'extend their criticism, or rather scepticism, both to 'the language of Persia and the Indo-gangetic languages of 'Hindustan.'

The second volume begins with the *Pronouns*, which as we now know, form the oldest elements of language, although they have long been considered as mere expedients to avoid too frequent a repetition of substantives. The apparently irregular forms in the declension of pronouns, are proved by Professor Bopp to be, on the contrary, the most regular, in so far as they have preserved the old Arian terminations with greater fidelity than either nouns or adjectives. It is, indeed, one of the principal results of Comparative Philology to have proved that, in language, there is nothing irregular, in the usual sense of the word. Former grammarians considered everything as irregular which did not conform to rules which they had themselves invented: and it was seriously maintained, for instance, that, in the Teutonic languages, 'all verbs were originally irregular.' A language, however, as Archdeacon Hare remarks, could no more coalesce out of irregular words, than a world could out of the indeterminate atoms of Epicurus. The coincidences between the Arian languages with respect to the so-called irregular forms of the pronouns, are most striking, and extremely instructive in their applications to Greek and Latin grammar. How great an interest has been taken in these 'venerable relics 'of language,' may be seen from the considerable number of works exclusively dedicated to a comparative analysis of the pronouns. We shall only mention the two most important,—that by W. von Humboldt 'On the Relation of Local Adverbs 'with the Pronouns of different Languages,' and by Bopp 'On 'the Influence of Pronouns on the Formation of Words in Sanskrit and the Cognate Languages.'

---

<i>Singular.</i>		<i>Plural.</i>
* Greek = Sanskrit.		Greek = Sanskrit.
ὅψ = vâ'k.		ὅπες = vâ'chas.
ὁπός = vâchás.		ὁπών = vâchâ'm.
ὁπί = vâchí.		ὁπί = vâkshú.
ὅπα = vâ'cham.		ὅπαç = vâ'chas.

*Dual.*

ὅπε	=	vâ'châ.
ὁποῖν	=	vâgbhyâ'm.

The most difficult, but at the same time the most brilliant, part of Comparative Philology, is the *Verb*. Before the appearance of his Comparative Grammar, Professor Bopp had written on the formation of the Verb, and his 'Conjugations-System' was translated into English as early as 1820, in the *Annals of Oriental Literature* ('Analytical Comparison of the Sanskrit, Greek, Latin, and Teutonic Languages'). We may dispense with giving a detailed account of Professor Bopp's theory on this subject, as the principal results of these researches have been put before the public by several eminent English writers, whose works have either modified or more fully illustrated some points of Bopp's system. We allude in particular to Donaldson's *Cratylus*, and the Rev. R. Garnett's valuable *Articles*.\* But with regard to the general tenor of Bopp's investigations, if his object had been no higher one than to prove the connexion of the Arian conjugations, a few paradigms would have been sufficient, instead of the 825 paragraphs devoted by him to this subject. Coincidences like those which run through the principal tenses and moods of the verb in all Arian languages, put the question as to their common origin beyond the reach of reasonable doubt.

For instance,—

IMPERFECT.							
Singular.				Plural.			
Sanskrit.	Greek.	Sanskrit.	Greek.	Sanskrit.	Greek.	Sanskrit.	Greek.
atarp-a-m, (I pleased).	ἴριγ-ο-ν.	atarp-a-ma.	ἴριγ-ο-μιν.	atarp-a-ta.	ἴριγ-ο-ν.	atarp-a-n.	ἴριγ-ο-ν.
atarp-a-s.	ἴριγ-ι-ν.						
atarp-a-t.	ἴριγ-ι-ν.						
Dual.							
Sanskrit.		Sanskrit.	Greek.				
atarp-a-va.		atarp-a-tam.	ἴριγ-ι-ν.				
atarp-a-tam.			ἴριγ-ι-ν.				
atarp-a-tām.			ἴριγ-ι-ν.				
PRESENT.							
Singular.							
Sanskrit.	Zend.	Greek.	Latin.	Gothic.	Lithuanian.	Old-Slavonic.	
vah-ā-mi, (I carry).	vaz-ā-mi.	ἵξ-ω-ν.	vah-o-ν.	vīg-a-ν.	wex-u.	vez-u.	
vah-a-si.	vaz-a-hi.	ἵξ-ι-ν.	vah-i-s.	vīg-i-s.	wex-i.	vez-i.	
vah-a-ti.	vaz-a-ti.	ἵξ-ι-ν.	vah-i-t.	vīg-i-th.	wex-a-ν.	vez-a-ν.	
Dual.							
vah-ā-vas.	.....	ἵξ-ι-ν.	.....	vīg-ō-s.	wex-a-wa.	vez-o-va.	
vah-a-tha.	vaz-a-thō.	ἵξ-ι-ν.	.....	vīg-a-ts.	wex-a-ta.	vez-o-ta.	
vah-a-tas.	vaz-a-tō.	ἵξ-ι-ν.	.....	.....	.....	vez-o-ta.	
Plural.							
vah-ā-mas.	vaz-ā-mahf.	ἵξ-ο-μιν.	vah-i-mux.	vīg-a-m.	wex-a-me.	vez-o-me.	
vah-a-tha.	vaz-a-tha.	ἵξ-ι-ν.	vah-i-tla.	vīg-i-th.	wex-a-te.	vez-o-te.	
vah-a-nti.	vaz-o-nti.	ἵξ-ο-ν.	vah-u-nt.	vīg-a-nd.	.....	vez-utj.	

Bopp's great merit, however, does not consist in having pointed out these coincidences, but in having explained them, by tracing most minutely the origin and progress of verbal forms in the different languages of the Arian stock. A classical scholar, there-

\* Published in the Transactions of the Philological Society.

fore, even if he takes no interest but in Greek and Latin, will discover in the 'Comparative Grammar' the most useful information on the verb of these two languages. It is true that, after studying this work, he will not find himself a better hand at composing hexameters in the language of Homer, or writing essays in the style of Cicero. But, as astronomers admit it to be useful to know the construction of the instruments, and even the nature of the materials of which they are made, before they use them for observing, classical scholars also will find that the time has not been wasted which they may bestow on the analysis of language and the elements of which it is composed.

If we conjugate the Latin passive, I am loved, *amor, amaris, amatur, amamur, amamini, amantur*, it is easy to observe that *amamini* steps out of all analogy with the other passive persons. Nothing but the circumstance that former grammarians did not trouble themselves at all with the foundation of lingual phenomena, and that the relation between the Greek and Latin was not systematically and scientifically traced out, can account for the fact that the form *amamini* had so long found its place in the paradigms, without raising the question how and whence it came there. Professor Bopp, in 1816, was the first to bring the form under discussion in his 'Conjugations-System;' and he shows there that *amamini* is a passive participle in the masculine nominative plural, and that *amamini* for *amamini estis* is explained by the analogous form of the Greek perfect, *τετυμμένοι εἰσι*. The Latin suffix is *minu-s*, and corresponds to the Greek *μενος*, and Sanskrit *mān-as*. From the fact, however that these participles in Latin are thrust aside in ordinary practice, *mini* has, in the second person plural, where it has continued as if petrified, assumed the character of a verbal termination; and thus, also, after losing the consciousness of its nominal nature, has renounced its distinction of gender, and its appendage *estis*. If we found *amaminæ* for the feminine, and *amamina* for the neuter, we should be spared the trouble of seeking an explanation for *amamini*, inasmuch as it would partly be afforded by the language itself. There are several objections which might be raised against this explanation by classical scholars. The first is, that if *amamini* be a passive participle in the masculine plural, one should expect *amaminæ* and *amamina* with feminine and neuter substantives. This objection is met by a reference to the Sanskrit, where similar periphrastic forms of the future equally retain the masculine terminations, although they are followed by feminines and neuters. Another objection is, that this peculiar termination of the passive and medial participle exists as *mānu* in Sanskrit, *μενος* in Greek, *ma* in Lithuanian,



and *manas* in Old Prussian, but never occurs in Latin. Against this Professor Bopp points out the Latin *alu-m'nus* and *Vertu-m'nus*, which evidently belong to these participial formations, but have lost the *i*. The *i*, however, has been preserved in *terminus*, 'frontier,' if we consider it as expressing 'that which is over-stepped,' and identify its root with the Sanskrit *tar* (Lat. trans). *Femina*, too (as giving birth, and therefore having a middle sense), has been recognised as a formation belonging to the same category, the root being *fe*, from which, also, *fe-tus*, *fe-tura*, *fe-cundus*. The third and most weighty objection is the Imperative *amaminor*. For, if *amamini* be the plural of a participle, it would be impossible to append to it the *r* of the passive. However, this objection, too, can be removed. *Amaminor* is nothing but the older form of *amamini*, and the final *or* is the old termination of the plural, which we have in the Eugubian Tables, where *subator* occurs, for the Latin *subacti*, *sorehitor* for *scripti*. Further, the singulars of the second masculine declension in the Umbrian end in *o*; and we find *orto* for *ortus*, *subato* for *subactus*. Now, in accordance with this singular form in *o*, there are extant, also, in Latin, singular imperatives in *mino*, namely, *famino* in Festus, *prafamino* in Cato, and *fruinino* in an inscription, 'is cum agrum nci habeto nei' 'fruinino,' 'he shall neither have nor use this field.' *Amaminor*, therefore, is the regular old plural of *amamino*; and this archaic form has been preserved in the imperative, while *amamini* became fixed as the second person plural in the present.

We hope that we have not wearied out the patience of our readers, by giving this one instance, out of many, in proof how much advantage Classical Philology might derive from Comparative Philology. Professor Bopp's Grammar is not a work for Oriental scholars only. The Grammar itself supplies all the knowledge that is needed, in order to understand what is taken in it from the Oriental languages. The principles of the Sanskrit, as the groundwork and connecting bond of the comparison, are exhibited in some detail, and, for the Zend language, there is even more than is needed. By a transcription in Roman characters, a translation and analysis, the examples taken from the Sanskrit and Zend are as intelligible as those derived from Gothic and Slavonic. Classical scholars (to use the word in its present restricted sense) may therefore study the work without difficulty; and they will find it a rich mine for their own researches. It is, of course, not to be expected that comparative grammar will ever be introduced into schools: and it would be injurious to the effects of education to exchange a thorough knowledge of Greek and Latin for

a less accurate acquaintance with many languages. But it is one thing to learn a language, another to teach it, *i. e.* to describe its mechanism and organisation. The learner may confine himself within the strictest limits, and forbear to look beyond the narrowest boundaries of the subject of his study: the teacher's glance, on the contrary, must pass beyond the narrow limits of the language which he has to explain, and command at least a general view of the historical growth of the forms of human speech.

Comparative Philology, however, is not confined, in its results, to the organisation and history of languages, but it sheds also a new light over the history of nations. If it is once recognised that the Latin stands to the Greek not in the relation of a daughter, but of a sister, it follows that the historical relation of Italy and Greece, particularly with regard to the oldest times, will have to be viewed in the same light.\* Instead of looking to Greece for the elements of Italian civilisation,---to Egypt and Phenicia for what made Greece what she was, our eyes will be directed to those parts of the world where language preserves to us the traces of the early migrations of the Arian tribes. If it can be proved that the words for many of the arts belonging to an early state of civilisation are the same in Sanskrit, Greek, Latin, and German, it follows that the Arian nations knew these arts before they separated, and that they carried the germs of civilisation from a common centre on one side into India, and, on the other side, into Asia Minor, Greece, Italy, and the rest of Europe.

The conclusions which Niebuhr attempted to draw from the fact that 'the words for a house, a field, a plough, ploughing, 'wine, oil, milk, swine, sheep, apples, and others relating to 'agriculture and the gentler ways of life, agree in Latin and 'Greek, while the Latin words for all objects pertaining to war 'or the chase are utterly alien from the Greek',†, are altogether invalid in the eyes of Comparative Philologists. Professor Lassen was the first to show it in his Article on the Eugubian Inscriptions.‡ Niebuhr thought he could prove by this ingenious observation, that the Sicelians, a peaceful Greek colony, had been conquered by the Cascans or the warlike inhabitants of Italy. First of all, it would be very unlikely that the Sice-

---

\* This point has well been illustrated in a small but very interesting essay, 'On the results of Comparative Philology in reference to 'Classical Scholarship,' by Dr. G. Curtius, lately translated into English.

† Niebuhr, *History of Rome*, i. 83.

‡ *Rhenish Museum* for 1833, p. 361. *seq.*

lians should have had no names for martial, and the Cascans no words for agricultural occupations before they came into contact with each other. Secondly, the observation which Niebuhr made with regard to Latin and Greek, applies with equal force to all Indo-european languages. They all exhibit the most striking coincidences in words expressive of the first peaceful occupations of mankind, while the terms connected with chase and war are mostly peculiar to each. There is no reason, therefore, why these words which the Greeks and Romans have in common, should be called a Greek element in Latin. Since the same words occur in all the Indo-european languages, they can only be considered as a common Arian element, that is to say, as words which existed before the Arian family was broken up. Many of these words have even preserved a more primitive form in Latin than in Greek. We could hardly imagine that *ovis* should be taken from *ōis*, if we see that the original form of this word is *avis* in Sanskrit, *awis* in Lithuanian, and *cowu* in Anglo-saxon. The Latin *pecus* is much nearer to Sanskrit *pas'u*, Prussian *pecku*, and Gothic *faihu*, than to the Greek *πῶν*; nor could we call the Latin *canis* a derivative from the Greek *κύων*, if we see how much more closely the Latin word resembles the Sanskrit *s'van*, and the Slavonic *hon'*. Besides some of the so-called martial Cascan words are not peculiar to Latin, and though they do not occur in Greek, they are found either in Sanskrit, or in other Arian dialects, as, for instance, *ensis*, which is the Sanskrit *asis*, a sword; *scutum* which is the Lithuanian *skyda*, a shield, and is derived from the same root from which we have the Greek *σκῦτος*, a hide; for *scutum* means originally a dressed or tanned hide, the material which was used by the ancients for making shields.

But while in this case Comparative Philology must discountenance the historical conclusions which were drawn from too partial evidence, it enables us on the other hand to reconstruct on a firmer basis the oldest history of the whole Arian family, that is to say, on the evidence derived from an accurate and systematic comparison of all Indo-european languages.

There are words which form, so to speak, the common heirloom of the Arian family. These old relics are to be found among the tribes now settled in India, as well as among the nations of Europe, that is, among races who have had no lasting intercourse with one another since they first started from the common centre of mankind. If properly decyphered, these words might be made to furnish historical documents for times when neither Greece nor India were peopled by the Arians, — when neither Greek nor Sanskrit existed as separate languages,

—for times previous to Homer, the Zendavesta, and the Veda. For this primeval period, which is far beyond the reach of written history, single words, which have been scattered all over the earth like Sibylline leaves, if carefully gathered as historical documents, and decyphered by the help of Comparative Philology, may still be found to contain the faint traces of the earliest civilisation of the human race. The process by which these obliterated traces can be brought out and construed into historical evidence, does not form part of Comparative Grammar; and it would lead us too far to enter fully into a subject which, as yet, has remained almost untouched. One instance of the curious results which may thus be obtained, will suffice.

It is a question of deep interest to know whether any religious ideas can be discovered among the wandering tribes at that early period of history, when the mythology of the Arian nations—not yet separated—was following the impulse of its gradual development. Questions of this kind have usually been answered in a very vague manner, or according to theories which rested on preconceived notions, but not on facts. In the absence of all other historical documents, we can deduce such facts from language only; and we shall see how far Comparative Philology is able to supply them.

There are three words in the modern languages of Europe, which express the idea of God,—one belonging to the Romance dialects, the other to the Teutonic, the third to the Slavonic family. From an historical point of view, these words must be looked upon not as modern productions, but as the most ancient relics of language. It has been very truly observed that the modern nations of Europe are the oldest nations of the world. Their history, if more deeply investigated, if considered as the result and natural consequence of all previous history, discloses to our eyes a picture, where, behind the living foreground of the present generation, we see all the former stages in the progress of the human race arranged in true perspective, so as to form together one uninterrupted whole. Wherever we look around us, we are living among the ruins of a by-gone world; and if we attempt to read in History the biography of the human race, the ancient world forms but the prelude, with the interesting scenes of our childhood and youth, while each successive century brings us nearer to what may be called our manhood or old age. As in the life of the individual the experience of later years is everywhere interwoven with the early impressions of childhood, the Historian sees the image of the earlier ages of the world's history reflected in that of his own time. And, if he endeavours to trace the aggregate experience of the present day to its first

beginnings, he finds himself carried back to the very dawn of history, before he can lay his hand on the roots of the old Tree of knowledge. Looking only at the principal elements of modern society, we see that the Law of the present day, in spite of all innovations and revolutions, flows in its main channels either from the sacred customs of the Teutonic race, or from the codes of Roman emperors. These codes again were based on rogations, which at an earlier period of history were carried in the Senate or in the noisy forum of Rome; nay the laws of succession and inheritance, — of paternal authority and filial duty point back to still more remote times, when Numa was listening to Egeria, and when the mythic ancestors of the Latin people immigrated into Italy. The high-roads of our commerce which are now mapped down in the guide-books of peaceful travellers, follow in many cases the footsteps of Roman armies or Phœnician caravans; and the purest models in our modern school of art, what are they but the very creations which we hear the joyous people of Athens applauding at the foot of the Parthenon, fresh from the chisel of Phidias and Praxiteles? But nowhere is this view of modern history more strongly confirmed than if applied to language. There is an uninterrupted continuity in the growth, or, so to say, in the life of language, much more than in any succession of historical facts. For although it is in the power of one individual to change empires, to abolish laws, to introduce new customs, new forms of government and new ideas, no King or Dictator has ever been able to change the smallest law of language. Language belongs in this respect to the realm of nature, whose laws *are* invariable, and can be deduced as such, by repeated observation.\* The laws of history on the contrary are not invariable, or, at all events, it is impossible to deduce them by observation ever so

---

\* 'The phenomena of our globe declare, that the laws of Nature, or the operations of secondary causes, physical or physiological, *have not been* invariably uniform, or absolutely similar; some peculiar to the nascent world, all more intense; the collective life of all classes of animated beings endued with the vigour and flexibility of individual youth. Species and their varieties seem to have been produced by an inward nîsus, which decreased with the advancing age of the world. The like with respect to languages. The process of linguistic formation did not suddenly terminate. A certain degree of vitality, now lost to us, was still subsisting; somewhat also of the generative energy of speech, "until" about the era when the Canon of Holy Scripture was closed by the last mysterious book of Prophecy.' — *Palgrave's History of Normandy and England*, vol. i. c. 2. 'On the Roman Language.' Where is the evidence of this 'until'?

minute. Moreover the history of man is retrogressive as well as progressive. It is in the power of one generation to bring an art to the highest pitch of perfection, while the next generation may allow it to relapse, till a new genius takes it up again with increased ardour. This is not the case with language. New languages have arisen, but like the young shoots round a decayed trunk, they are but new forms of the old stock. As far as we can follow the history of the world, there has never been an absolutely new language, nor has any addition been made to those radical elements by means of which languages are formed. It is only out of the tombs of dead languages that new languages arise, like new towns, built on the ruins of ancient cities. The bricks with which the modern city of Baghdad is built on the borders of the Tigris, bear all, as Colonel Rawlinson \* tells us, the cuneiform legend of Nebuchadnezzar, stamped upon them, for they had been taken from the ruins of the ancient cities built by this Assyrian monarch. In the same way, if we examine the structure of modern dialects, we shall find that each word bears still the unmistakable stamp of an older language whose decayed fragments have furnished the materials for a new structure.

These preliminary observations were necessary in order to determine the point of view from which we may look on languages whether ancient or modern, as historical documents, and they will explain how it is possible, by laying hold of the nearest points of our own language, to communicate, as it were telegraphically, with the remotest antiquity of the human race.

We begin with the Slavonic word for God, which is '*Bog.*' This word, which is used by the different branches of the Slavonic family to express the idea of God, was employed by

---

\* 'It was a custom, borrowed from Assyria, that the bricks used in building the ancient cities on the Lower Tigris and Euphrates should be stamped with the name and titles of the royal founder. With regard to Babylonia Proper, it is a remarkable fact, that every ruin from some distance north of Baghdad, as far south as the Birs Nimroud, is of the age of Nebuchadnezzar. I have examined the bricks *in situ*, belonging, perhaps, to one hundred different towns and cities within this area, and I never found any other legend than that of Nebuchadnezzar, son of Nabopolassar, King of Babylon. At Baghdad itself the right bank of the river within the town is formed for the space of nearly one hundred yards of an enormous mass of brickwork, which until lately was supposed to be of the time of the Caliphs, but which I found on examining the bricks to date from the age of Nebuchadnezzar.' — *On the Inscriptions of Assyria and Babylonia.* 'Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society,' vol. xii. p. 476.

the early inhabitants of the Russian Empire as a name of their heathen deities. According to Schaffarik, in his excellent work on Slavonic Antiquities, it can be proved that the old Sarmatic tribes worshipped a supreme God,—the creator of heaven and earth,—though they admitted at the same time several lesser gods, who were the mediators between man and the Supreme Being, and who received sacrifices, consisting of cattle and fruits.\* The old Slaves believed in a resurrection, and in rewards and punishments after death. Now this name *Bog*, which we find spread over the immense area of the Slavonic empire, has its origin not in the steppes of Russia, but in the valleys of Northern India. It is known that the Slavonic dialects belong to the Arian family, and, in Sanskrit, *Bhaga* means originally the sun. For instance, Rig-veda, i. 136. 2. ‘The wide-shining Dawn has been seen ascending to the sky,—the path of the Eternal is full of rays; full of rays is the eye of ‘Bhaga.’ *Bhaga* is, indeed, among the principal deities of the Veda; and in the epic poem, also, his name is by no means forgotten. The word *bhaga* is derived from a root *bhag*, to divide, and signifies the divider, distributor, or ruler. There are many similar names given to the sun by the old nations of the world, who looked upon this celestial luminary as the emblem of order, the divider of day and night, the author of the seasons, the source of time, and the ruler of the heavens. But the same word *bhaga* is also used in the Veda as a general term for deity; and in the Zendavesta, where it occurs as *baga*, it has entirely adopted the abstract meaning of God. The same form, *baga*, is found again on the rock inscriptions of the Persian kings. The upper inscription on the sepulchre of Darius at Nakshi-Rustani, begins with the following words: “Baga wazarka Auramazdâ, hya imâm bumim adâ, hya awam ‘asmânam adâ, hya martiyam adâ, hya shiyâtim adâ martiyahyâ, ‘hya Dûryavum khshâyathiyam akunaush, aivam pauruvanâm ‘khshâyathiyam, aivam paruvanâm framâtaram.’ ‘A great ‘God is Ormazd, who created this earth, who created that ‘heaven, who created man, who gave life to man, who made ‘Darius king,—the only king of the people,—the only law-giver of the people.’ In the inscription of Behistun, which Colonel Rawlinson has decyphered with such singular ingenuity and so vast an amount of learning, we find the same word

---

\* There are even traces of human sacrifices among some tribes on the shore of the Baltic. But Schaffarik thinks that this barbarous custom does not occur among the pure Russians, that it had been introduced from without, and, at all events, that it did not last for a long period.

in the plural also, *bagâha*, meaning 'the gods.' For instance, 'Says Darius the king, On that account Ormazd brought help 'and the other *gods* which are, because that I was not a heretic, 'nor was I a liar, nor was I a tyrant.' The very name of the sacred rock of Behistun, on the western frontiers of Media, on the high-road conducting from Babylonia to the eastward, where Darius had the royal charter of the Achæmenian dynasty engraved in arrow-head characters,—was originally 'bhaga-'sthîná,' 'the abode of the gods,' or, according to Diodorus Siculus, 'the abode of Zeus.'\* Here, in the name of Behistun, we see the old word *bhaga*, much more changed and corrupted than in the Slavonic *bog*; and we learn from this, that the name by which God is invoked by the present Czar of Russia, is the very same word which was used by Darius, by Zoroaster, and by the poets of the Veda; that is to say, we find the roots of a word which lives in the nineteenth century of the Christian era, in the fourth, the eighth, and the fourteenth century before Christ.

It is much more difficult to trace the Teutonic word, 'God,' back to its origin. There is no doubt that the Supreme Being has always been called by this name in all German tongues. We have *guþ* in Gothic, *god* in Anglo-Saxon, *cot* in Old-High German, *gud* in Swedish and Danish, and *gott* in modern German. The most natural supposition, if we took into account our modern languages only, would be to take *god* as the same word, or as derived from the same root, as *good*. This may, indeed, be considered as the common Christian etymology of the word 'god,' and an apparent authority has been found for it in the passage in the gospel of St. Mark, 'there is none good but one, that is God.'† But this etymology is indeed essentially Christian, and the occurrence of the same German word in the old heathen world, and for the old heathen gods, is fatal to it. Besides, although *God* and *good* have a very similar sound in English, the two words diverge, if we trace them back to the ancient German languages. Good in Gothic is not *guþ* but *gods*, in Anglo-Saxon not *god* but *gôd*, in Old-High German not *cot* but *cuot*, in Danish not *gud* but *god*, in Dutch not *god* but *goed*. However, Comparative Philology has not yet been able to substitute a better etymology. The most common opinion of comparative philologists—we are not able to say with whom it originated—that the Teutonic *God* is the same as the Persian

\* Diodorus speaks of τὸ δὲ Βαγίσταρον ὄρος, ἔστι μὲν ἑρὸν Διός.—Cf. *Rawlinson's Memoirs*, p. 187.

† In Anglo-Saxon, 'Nis nân man gôd buton god âna.' Gothic, 'Ni hvashun þiuþeigs alja ains guþ.'



*Khodá*—is equally untenable. *Khodá* means, indeed, God in Persian; but it is a word which, according to the phonetic laws of the Iranian tongue, must have sounded *havadá* or *havadâta* in the old language of Darius or Zoroaster. Its meaning would be 'self-produced.' But how is it credible that a word, which only after the time of Darius could possibly have taken the form of *Khodá* \* in Persian, should, under this peculiarly Persian and modern Persian form, have been transmitted to the old Teutonic nations? Another etymology has been attempted by bringing the Teutonic word at once into connexion with the Sanskrit 'Gûdha,' which means 'hidden, concealed, a mystery.' But this word again is much too metaphysical to furnish a real and natural explanation of so primitive a word as 'God.' We can only say, therefore, that 'God' was probably an old Teutonic word, used long before the introduction of Christianity, to signify either one Supreme Being, or gods in general. Indeed, we find that in the Old Norse, *god* in the neuter means a graven image, an idol, while *gud* in the masculine signifies God. Other Teutonic nations, after they had been converted, called their old heathen gods *abgotts* (Old-High German *apcot*), which makes it still more likely that *god* had been used by them before in the abstract sense of *deus*. In modern German an idol is called *ein Götze*, which is evidently derived from *Gott*; and Luther translates the verse from the Fifth Book of Moses, 'And ye shall hew down the graven images of their gods' by 'die Götzen ihrer Götter.'

The third word which we have still to consider, is the Latin *deus*, together with its modern derivations in Italian, Spanish, and French. The history of this term can be traced much more satisfactorily than the Teutonic word; and it allows us a deep insight into the silent vegetation not only of words and roots, but also of names and ideas.

There is an old root in Sanskrit—*div*, to shine—which, according to a general rule of Sanskrit grammar, may be changed into *dyu*. From this root comes the Greek word *Zeús*, which, by a regular transition of letters, is nothing but the root *dyu* or *yu* with the *s* of the nominative, and corresponds, therefore, exactly to the Sanskrit *Dyaus*. The Greek language does not

---

\* 'Le mot *Khodai*, seigneur, qui sous les Sassanides avait été appliqué aux rois, ne servait, depuis l'introduction de l'Islamisme, que pour désigner Dieu; de sorte que Firdousi pouvait craindre qu'on ne lui reprochât comme un blasphème le titre de la source principale de son ouvrage (*Khodai námeh*), et toute accusation d'impicité, si frivole qu'elle fût, était grave pour le poète au milieu de la cour jalouse et bigote de Mahmoud.'—*J. Mohl, Shah-nameh*, Introduction, p. x.

admit of two such consonants as *dy* at the beginning of a word. It has sometimes dropped the first, sometimes the second letter. Dropping the *y*, we get the Greek form Δεύς, which, according to ancient authorities, was used instead of Ζεύς. The initial *d* is likewise preserved in the accusative Δία. Dropping the first letter, the Sanskrit *y* is regularly changed into the Greek ζ—(like Sansk. yuj = ζευγνυμι, Sansk. yava = ζέα)—so that Ζεύς may, indeed, be considered as the Greek pronunciation of the Sanskrit *yaus*. In Latin there is no nominative, like *Jos*, which would be the Latin form, corresponding to Sanskrit *Dyaus*, but the old word reappears in the oblique cases, where we have *Jovem*, &c. Other words, like *Dispater* and *Diespiter*, show that, like the Greek and Sanskrit, the Latin also knew both forms of the ancient root. The corresponding words in Old German are *Zio* and *Tius*, one of our old heathen gods, now long forgotten, but whose name still lives in the name of Tuesday.

It has generally been supposed, that the Sanskrit language and religion did not know *Dyaus* as a god, but that *dyaus* in Sanskrit, as a feminine, was used only for heaven and sky. Yet, if we examine the Sanskrit in its oldest form, as we find it in the Veda, traces can still be discerned, proving the former existence of a god *Dyaus*. It is true, that in the Commentaries, *dyaus* is always explained by the resplendent sky. But it may be observed in the hymns of the Veda, that the word *dyaus*, which is a feminine, is sometimes used as a masculine, and in these cases it always means the god *Dyaus*. Thus we read in the Rig-Veda :

‘When the pious man offers his morning libation to the great Father *Dyaus*, he trembles all over, as he becomes aware that the archer sent forth from his mighty bow the bright dart that reaches him, and, brilliant himself, gave his own splendour unto his daughter, the Dawn.’ Moreover, Aurora is frequently called *duhitâ Divah*, which is usually translated by the ‘daughter of the sky.’ But, according to the principles of mythology, she cannot be the daughter of the sky. She is produced by the Sun from Night, and, therefore, she is the daughter of Night and of the Sun, that is to say, of the god *Dyaus*.

Although, then, to the Indian mind, the name of the god *Dyaus* was lost already at an early period, because his name had become the usual word for sky, as in Latin ‘sub dio,’ and because poets and priests soon introduced other names for this deity, as Agni, Indra, Mitra, and the like, yet we see, that he was once known under his old Arian name in India, and we thus arrive at a result which flashes, like a sudden ray of light, through the dark world of the first mythological ideas among the Arian nations. We see that, before their separation took

place, they had a name for a god, expressive of the brilliancy of the sun, the sky and daylight, that they called him 'Dyaus,' and the 'Great Father.' We see that Zeus was not an invention of Homer, that Jupiter was not borrowed from Greece — but that long before the Arians immigrated into Greece and Italy, they had worshipped the same god under the same name — that the Brahmans who migrated towards the South invoked him along the rivers of the Penjáb, and that the Teutonic nations proceeding towards the North, celebrated the same god on the mountains of Scandinavia.

Dyaus, as the name of this old Arian god, means light, but not light, in its abstract sense, not as a feminine or a neuter, but as a masculine, as the shining sun, the bringer of light and life. It was a happy thought of the sons of nature, who first raised their eyes up to heaven, to perceive there, high above them, the brilliant manifestation of a divine power: and it was a happy grasp of language, to express the awful feeling of the existence of a divine power by a word which meant light. It was the light of the sun, by which men were awakened every morning from the sleep of night, and with the setting of the sun, their own life faded away into an unconscious slumber. That brilliant globe, whence they received light and warmth, the silent majesty of whose daily course the clear atmosphere of the Himalayan regions permitted them to witness, must have excited the feeling of devotion in every human heart; and, although the poetical genius of men may have perceived afterwards the active presence of a divine power, in other forms of nature, from no other source could it have beamed with greater splendour. If then, as we cannot doubt, the consciousness of God was latent in the hearts of all men, like a veiled remembrance of a former world, it was the power of the Sun that pierced and lifted the veil, and thus brought the idea of God in its brightness before the eyes of the heathens. How natural, that the name of the Revealer should have been given to that which he revealed, and that the sun, by which the glory of God became first manifest in this world to the senses of men, should have been taken as a manifestation of God himself! Nothing in this world could have been nearer, no image worthier to represent and express God, than the sun; and it shows the existence of a transcendental power in the mind of those early worshippers, that they looked for their God, not in the world around them, which they could touch and grasp, (fetichism,) but up to that world, which one sense only, and that the highest, presented to the mind's eye.

What we have here said, however, would only prove that, the Arian nations possessed some of their mythological gods in

common, but it would not enable us to affirm that they had also felt the want of an expression for the simpler and purer idea of God in those early times when they were still connected by the bonds of a common language, and of a common faith. In order to prove this, we must take into account another class of common Arian words, formed from the same root *div*, by means of a derivative, which gives to these words a more general and abstract meaning. These words are *deva* in Sanskrit, *Zeús* in Greek, *deus* in Latin, *dievas* in Lithuanian. *Deva*, which means originally bright, brilliant, divine, expresses a quality equally ascribable to all the different forms and names of God that had arisen out of the individualising spirit of language; and it adapted itself, therefore, most easily and naturally to express the general and essential idea of God, godly, divine. This is already the case in the Veda, although the transparency of the vedic language permits, in most cases, the original meaning of the word *deva* — that of brilliancy — to shine through. Whether, for instance, the old poets meant to say the 'divine Aurora,' or the 'brilliant dawn,' by calling Ushas (aurora) as well as her rays, *deví*, must remain doubtful in many passages. In Greek and Latin, however, *Zeús* and *deus*, are neither attribute nor name of God, but they have really become the word for God, expressing at once the abstract idea of the philosopher, the poetical image of the old bards, and the breathing creation of the sculptor.

---

\* These pages were all but struck off before we had seen a most interesting pamphlet by Sir George Staunton: 'An Inquiry into the proper mode of rendering the word "God," in translating the Sacred Scriptures into the Chinese language.' Although it refers to a country with which, as far as we know, the Arian tribes have had no connexion in language or history, it offers the most striking parallel with regard to the progress of language, and its influence on the human mind among the Chinese and the Indo-European nations. There has been a long controversy between the different sects of Christian Missionaries as to the best way of rendering the word 'God' into Chinese. The first preachers of the Gospel who visited China accepted without scruple the Chinese words *Tien* and *Shang-tee*, which they found already in popular use. The word *Tien*, however, though, according to the imperial dictionary of Kanghee, it means 'the Great One, He that dwells on high and regulates all below,' is also used in a physical and material sense, as heaven, and in that sense it constantly occurs in the most familiar language. It is even used in the sense of 'day.' *Kin tien*, literally 'new heaven,' means only 'to-day,' and *ming tien*, literally 'bright heaven,' means 'to-morrow.' We must here add, that exactly the same takes place in Sanskrit. From the same root *Div*, from which, as we have seen, *Zeus*, *Dispater*, and *Deus* were derived, we also have *dies*, in

We see, thus, that the word *deva*, by which, in the course of time, language seems to have recovered the idea of God, was derived from the same root *div*, from which those other words had arisen, by which language had failed at first to express the same idea (*Dyaus*, *Zeús*, &c.). We see, also, that this second step must have been made before the Indo-European separation.

Sanskrit, *diva*, 'day;' we have in Sanskrit *dyaus*, and in Latin *sub dio*, in the sense of 'heaven.' Nay, in the same way as the Chinese says *Kin tien*, 'to-day,' the Hindu uses *a-dya*, literally, 'this heaven' or 'this day,' in the sense of 'to-day,' hodie. Now, on the strength of this supposed equivocal meaning of the word *Tien*, the Pope, in 1715, issued an Apostolic precept, by which the Missionaries were prohibited from using the word *Tien* in the sense of God, though they were allowed to use it for 'heaven.' The decision of the Pope was, of course, final, and it was implicitly obeyed by the Roman Catholic missionaries of every order. The phrase *Tien-chu*, or Lord of Heaven, has accordingly been universally and invariably adopted by all Chinese Roman Catholic Christians from that time to this day. Whether in passages like that in the parable of the Prodigal Son, 'I have sinned against Heaven,' the Pope would have allowed the use of *Tien* does not appear. But he has equally excommunicated the other Chinese word for God, — *Shang-tee*, which is the same as *Tien* — heaven, that is, the God of Heaven. The Abbé Grosier, in his 'History of China,' gives a striking account of the character and attributes of *Shang-tee*, the Divinity or Supreme Being from the King, or canonical books of the Chinese.

In spite of this, *Tien* and *Shang-tee* were stigmatised by the Roman Catholics as heathen idols, not better than the Zeus, or Jupiter, of the Greeks and Latins. As a natural consequence, the Christians are popularly considered by the Chinese as the introducers of a new and strange God, a sort of idol of their own, which they call *Tien-Chu*; and this notion has been sedulously inculcated, until very lately, in successive edicts by the Government. We hope that the views so admirably advocated by Sir G. Staunton may prevail with the Missionary Societies in Europe and America, and that the old word *Shang-tee* may be re-adopted by Christians of whatever denomination in China. Upon a deliberate consideration of all the bearings of the questions, Sir George observes, 'It still may be right to reject the term *Tien-Chu*, but I cannot agree with those who think that this should be done upon the specific ground of it being advantageous or desirable that Protestant and Roman Catholic Christians in China should be distinguished from each other by their employment of different words for the Deity. This distinction may be unavoidable, but it must always be a matter of regret, from its tendency to suggest to the Chinese that Protestants and Roman Catholics do not worship the same God, which is not only untrue in itself, but is a mischievous exaggeration of the difference between the two forms of faith, which can have no other effect in China but that of discrediting our common Christianity.'

And now, that generations after generations have passed away, with their languages, — adoring and worshipping the name of God, — preaching and dying in the name of God, — thinking and meditating over the name of God, — there the old word stands still, as the most ancient monument of the human race — *ære perennius* — breathing to us the pure air of the dawn of humanity, carrying with it all the thoughts and sighs, the doubts and tears of our by-gone brethren, and still rising up to heaven with the same sound from the basilicas of Rome and the temples of Benares, as if embracing by its simple spell millions and millions of hearts, in their longing desire to give utterance to the unutterable, to express the inexpressible.

It may be seen from this single instance that Comparative Grammar addresses itself not only to the Grammarian, but to the Philosopher and the Historian also. It has opened a new and a safe path through a forest hitherto impervious, and it is now for other sciences to follow, and to gather with a careful hand the fruits which are brought within their reach.

ART. II. — *Memoirs of the Dukes of Urbino, illustrating the Arms, Arts, and Literature of Italy, from 1440 to 1630.*  
By JAMES DENNISTOUN of Dennistoun. 3 vols. 8vo.  
London: 1850.

URBINO, the birth-place of Raphael, is a name familiar to every body; but the place itself lies so much out of the highway, both of travellers and historians, and the petty princes who once reigned in it are, consequently, so little known, that even lovers of books, if their reading does not happen to lie in such directions, will have been almost as much surprised at the sight of Mr. Dennistoun's splendid volumes, as they would be at meeting as many portly footmen in blue and gold, clearing the way in the streets for the Kings of Brentford. The sweet painter, for the last two hundred years, has almost usurped the name of the Duchy; as his brother artist Allegri has done that of Correggio, and Claude Gélée that of Lorraine. Raphael d'Urbino every body knows; but who was Duke Federigo, and Duke Francesco Maria?

And, in truth, lovers of Italian literature, generally speaking, know little more of them. They meet them occasionally in the pages of Sismondi and Napier; of Black, Roscoe, and others; but it is either in the midst of petty wars, which leave nothing but confusion in the memory, or as obscure patrons of art and literature, whose names are not worth remembering beside those of the Medici and the Este. The best figure they make is in

Ginguené, but that is chiefly in connexion with one book. One book alone connected with them (the *Cortegiano* of Castiglione), became an Italian classic; and in their city was born, though not to flourish under their patronage, the great painter, without whom Mr. Dennistoun would not have been moved to write their history.

Nevertheless, for these very reasons among others, we hailed the appearance of Mr. Dennistoun's volumes; for he had much to tell us respecting men little known; and the prospect of seeing a graceful court revived, and distinguished names returning to us with new interest, made us open his work with no little eagerness. It seemed as if we were again looking down, through parting mists, on one of those spots in Italy, which we had long desired to behold; and that a new stock of pleasure was about to be added to our recollections.

Nor have our expectations been disappointed. Mr. Dennistoun's *Dukes*, whether for their virtues or their vices, their talents or their absurdities, are very interesting people; and Urbino itself, for the first time in our lives, has become a distinctly known place to us, — a clear, definite object, with its pinnacles and its households, quite different from what we had supposed it. We do not like to find fault with writers from whom we derive either amusement or information; Mr. Dennistoun has given us both; and therefore, although he himself is by no means free from those imperfections and inconsistencies, both in style and matter, which, in the writings of those who have gone before him, offend his own better judgment, yet as he always mingles what praise he can with blame, speaks with great modesty of his own literary pretensions, and mentions no living author but with direct or implied commendation, we shall give him the benefit due to so much good nature, and treat him with all considerate thankfulness. Indeed, it is but justice to our author to say, that besides his possession of a stock of new and curious information, he sometimes writes so well, that he wrongs himself in not doing so at all times. If he has not studied the subtler spirit of literary criticism, he is worth hearing on the subject of Art; and we think every impartial person will admit that, upon the whole, he has shown himself an inquiring, discerning, and — with allowance for a biographer's predilections — a liberal and conscientious writer, superior, except in one instance, to unhandsome prejudices, and anxious at all events for the triumph of the highest principles. Again, to speak unequivocally of the more visible ornaments of his work, they are by no means confined to the 'blue and gold.' They contain, besides pedigrees and facsimiles of handwriting, many illustrations in portraits and other pictures, not, indeed, well engraved, though

by Italians, but very interesting. One of them is a half length of Ariosto from Titian; another of Tasso; another of Castiglione; another of Raphael when a child, after his father; and there is a view of the city of Urbino, very striking from the towering and stony severity of its aspect,—so different from what might be expected of the birthplace of the gentle artist. But thence issued his passion and sincerity. We hope the portrait of Ariosto is genuine, for it is more like his writings than the older one in profile, which is also called Titian's. It has more force, geniality, and variety. That of Tasso makes the poet of the Jerusalem seem a poor creature. It has all his weakness, but nothing of his pride. That the portrait of Castiglione is by Raphael, the author doubts; but whomsoever it is by, it is a masterly production,—a living and breathing fact; and we see nothing in it to deprive it of the honour it enjoys. The painting, it is true, is not before us; and there may be something in the treatment of that, which implies a different hand: but the engraving is better than most in the three volumes,—less hard and slight; and there is a handwriting of art which strikes through the coarsest facsimiles, if they have the least resemblance to the spirit of the original. We shall feel henceforth that we know the face of Castiglione as well as if we had seen him.

We are sorry we cannot repeat some of Mr. Dennistoun's observations on Art. He has said much about it, and to the purpose; particularly as regards the religious precursors of Raphael, the culmination and declension of the religious spirit in the great painter himself, and the difference between a just admiration, and spurious imitation, of mediæval sincerity. We recommend his observations to those retrospective young gentlemen (natural stumblers on the road of progress) who take such pains to prove to us that they are not Raphaels, and who are nevertheless unable to be in earnest without turning to his precursors to help them. But as the subject is not new, we must hasten to other matter. We regret that we cannot notice even the accounts which Mr. Dennistoun gives us of the glazed and coloured pottery, called *majolica*, the renown of which Mr. Marryat also connects with Raphael and Urbino. Other nations of Europe have lately discovered what Italy knew long ago,—that as nature adorns her least as well as greatest works with beauty, so beauty may be brought to pervade artisanship as well as art; that as a daisy or a weed is gracefully turned, so may a pen be, or a spoon, or the knife that cuts the loaf; that a plate need not be clumsy, because it is cheap; nor the water-jug remind us of the dropsy, instead of being entwined with lilies. The moment poverty itself perceives the beautiful, it doubles its possessions.



Next to the blessing of peaceful intercourse, no higher lesson than this will have been taught by the Crystal Palace. But as *majolica* itself is to be found elsewhere, we must quit it for what Mr. Dennistoun's book is unique in showing us.

The only truly original topics of the work are the dukes themselves. Next to these in novelty is the court of Urbino, as depicted by Castiglione; and to these two points of interest we shall confine ourselves. The accounts of the sacking of Rome are worth reading; and a certain kind of interest is always roused by the Borgia family, whom our author has not forgotten. But he has added nothing to their history. We propose by and by making one suggestion respecting it, meaning, however, to notice nothing that does not, in some measure, bear upon the novelties of the work; and in whatsoever we do notice, we shall confine ourselves to the only permanent topics of interest in all ages; those which enable us to imagine ourselves under the same circumstances with the human beings who have gone before us, whether as actors or spectators.

The reader will bear in mind, that the space of time occupied by these annals of Urbino, namely, from 1440 to 1630, commences in the reign of our Henry the Fifth, and includes the reign of our First Charles. It is thus divided between the middle and modern ages; and the characters of our author's successive princes are to be estimated accordingly. During nearly one half of this period, the German emperors, content with the nominal sovereignty which they held from the Cæsars, had discontinued their wars in Italy, only to leave it the prey of its own. It was one incessant battle-ground of republics and principalities all struggling for existence or for ascendancy, now with one another, and now betwixt themselves, the Pope, like an evil genius, lording it in the midst of all, and 'more embroiling the fray' for his own purposes. During the other half of the period, Spain, France, and Austria interpleaded in arms for the sovereignty of this unhappy country, till at length they reduced it to the state in which it has since remained.

In times anterior to the first of these epochs, there had grown up a race of feudal chieftains, whose origin, according to a received phrase, was 'lost in the clouds of antiquity.' Like most such origins, it was probably not worth finding, its whole merit most likely consisting in the arm of some military adventurer on the fall of the Roman Empire. The name of this family, derived from one of their Apennine possessions, was Montefeltro; they lived near the town of Urbino, the old *Urbinum Hortense*, or Garden *Urbinum*, of Pliny, so called, in all probability, from a cultivation of the soil superior to that of the *Urbinum*, its namesake; though from a passage in Mon-

taigne, who saw the place during his travels, towards the close of the sixteenth century, it had singularly fallen off from its old reputation, only one petty garden surviving. These lords of Montefeltro, who had been made counts of the fief by the Emperor Frederick Barbarossa, were for some time Ghibellines, or adherents of the emperors, as distinguished from Guelfs, or pope's men; but Urbino is not far from Rome, and it suited the family to go over to his Holiness, who, in reward for their services, invested them as counts of the district, and finally as its dukes. By degrees, either as purchasers, conquerors, or deliverers, the warlike race acquired lordship in the neighbouring districts: a pope gave them more, with one of his kinsmen for a son-in-law; and the Duchy of Urbino finally swelled into an area forty miles long, and as many broad, partly consisting of rugged Apennines embosoming rich valleys, and partly of a line of coast on the Adriatic Sea. The region nearly corresponds with the modern legation of Urbino and Pesaro, that is to say, with one of the unhappy States of the Papal Church; for, on the last duke's becoming as childless as he was weak, it pleased his friend the Pope, vicar of one whose 'kingdom is not of this world,' to take the crown of it to himself, and so subject it to the same ecclesiastical misgovernment as the rest of central Italy.

In proceeding to make the reader acquainted with these successive Dukes of Urbino, after the particulars afforded us by Mr. Dennistoun, we shall first, in order to complete the intimacy, by showing in what sort of age they originated, extract a passage or two from his volumes equally illustrative and comprehensive. One is from a recent Italian writer, who makes us feel, in a very striking manner, the whole spirit of the old Italian struggles. From the second, which is by the author's own pen, we receive an equally forcible impression of the strange part that was taken in those struggles by the celebrated Condottieri, or mercenary leaders, national and foreign.

The 'feeble and unquiet domination' of the early princes of Italy (observes Mr. Dennistoun's author) 'was obtained sometimes by usurpation from rivals, from the people, or from the Church; sometimes by authority wrested originally from pope or emperor, and subsequently sanctioned; which was wielded now with more, now with less rigour. But these princes were, all of them, encompassed by a numerous following; were devoted to the profession of mercenary war; and were at once the abettors and dreaders of rebellions, ambushes, and poisonings.' (This word 'all,' as we shall see, is not to be taken to the letter; but the spirit of the truth is in it.) 'Various were the vicissitudes of these chiefs. In order to oust a competitor, they would offer large concessions to the Church or the populace; and

'having attained a sovereignty, would gradually curtail them until the community called in another master, to be in like manner supplanted by a third. In other cases they compromised their disputes by partitioning cities or principalities. Frequently the pontiff would favour one faction in order to put down another, and to profit by their mutual strife. Again, he would elevate a third over them both, under cloak of freedom. It was, in short, constant wavering between abuses and concession, tyranny and license; the seigneur intent upon extending his influence, although by dishonest means; the people prompt to diminish it, even to anarchy.' (Vol. i. p. 82.)

'This description,' observes Mr. Dennistoun, 'might be fitly applied to the Montefeltrian holdings under most of their early Counts.' It may be added, that thus grew the dominations of the Visconti and the Sforzas in Milan, of the Gonzagas in Mantua, of the Estes in Ferrara, of the Bentivoglios in Bologna, the Malatestas in Rimini, &c., and not only those, but the dominations of the republics over one another and over their own citizens; of Florence and Venice over their neighbours; of the Medici over Florence; of the King of Arragon over Naples; and of Popes and Emperors over all. For republics were as ambitious as principalities: equality was better understood than liberty, as it still is in some republics: Popes had no decency, and Emperors could not be expected to have what Popes derided.

But the most curious feature in the struggle remains to be noticed. Condottieri (conductors, a very different title upon highways at present) are personages well known to all who have journeyed in Italian history. Less political readers will have met with them in the pages of Mrs. Radcliffe. Our countrywoman has invested them, in her '*Mysteries of Udolpho*,' with a curious minor interest, between the terrible and the shabby, which is as different from that of the real people as a gaming-table is from a field of battle. Her chief, Montoni, was christened after one of the veritable brotherhood; but if she had known as much of real castles and Apennines as she did of old houses in the abstract, and of frightened young ladies, she never would have confounded her swindling fortune-hunters with the great military adventurers, cheats though they were, who became the terror of the Middle Ages, and the arbiters of power.

The condottieri originated in the imperial descents on Italy, and in the wars of the French and English. They were acceptable to the agricultural and commercial populations of Italy as substitutes for military service; excited the imitation of native

commanders; and, by tacit consent of one another, ended in reducing war to a trading speculation under the best bidder;—a business of stratagems, and ransoms, and exactions; bloodless, and a mere matter of profit, if it could be so contrived; ferocious on occasion; unprincipled always. There was the German Werner, who styled himself the ‘enemy of God;’ Hawkwood the Englishman, son of a tanner, whose name received thirteen versions from the despairing tongues of the Italians; Sforza, who is said to have been a wood-cutter; his son, who became Duke of Milan; Braccio da Montone, a feudal lord; a Frenchman (we forget his name), one of the greatest; Piccinino (Little One), a terrible fellow; Giovanni de Medici, called the Great Devil; the Malatestas, lords of Rimini; and, as the custom grew into repute, the Montefeltri themselves. For this hireling system easily became ennobled by princes who had already practised it under the name of allies and vassals; they glattly studied the art of war under its leaders; and the retaining salaries which were given them in large annual sums by the princes next in rank above them and by money-getting republics, ultimately grew into commanderships under greater powers, who thus enriched their poverty, secured their adhesion, and employed the restless portion of their subjects. The first princes, then styled counts, of Urbino, began their career under the most brutal phase of this system. The last duke had thirteen thousand men at the disposal of the King of Spain.

‘Any bold baron or experienced captain,’ says Mr. Dennistoun, ‘having formed round his banner a corps of tried and daring spirits, leased their services and his own for a stipulated term and price. Their whole arrangements being avowedly mercenary, they had no patriotism, no preference for standards or watchwords. The highest offer secured them; and when their engagement expired, or their pay fell into arrear, they were free to pass over to the enemy, or seek any other master. But besides their fixed stipend, they had perquisites from the hazards of war; the ransom of rich prisoners accrued to the leaders, while the soldiery were glutted by the occasional booty of a sacked city.

‘The changes occasioned by this system influenced Italy in its military, political, and social relations. Formerly, a truce disarmed the combatants, and sent them to forget their discipline in their domestic duties. Now, one campaign followed another, teaching the same free companies new evolutions and more perfect lessons in martial science; or if a piping-time of general peace ever arrived, their leaders scrupled not to keep them in practice by a private adventure of pillage against some feeble victim, until they should be required for the fresh contests which a few months were sure to develop. Their armour, accoutrements, and drill, thus became more complicated; men-at-arms and lances were considered the only effec-

tive troops. But their efficiency was counteracted by another result of stipendiary warfare. Exempt from enthusiasm in any cause, their tactics became a money question. To close a campaign by a series of brilliant successes was to kill the goose that gave them golden eggs; to carry havock into the adverse ranks was damaging to those who might be their next pay-masters or comrades. Sanguinary conflicts brought them danger without advantage, whilst the capture of an opponent or a camp ensured for them a rich prize. War was, in fact, a game which they were paid to play, with no interest in the stakes beyond their individual opportunities of plunder. Equally indifferent to past victories or future fame, they cared little for beating the enemy, could they but reach his baggage-waggons, or temporize until he could buy them off. Battles, thus deprived of their dangers and stirring interests, became great prize-fights, in which the victors deserved no sympathy, and the conquered required no commiseration. Gain was substituted for glory, languor for gallantry, calculation for courage. Patriotism slumbered; honesty of purpose and energy of action, fell into disuse; the parties in the match, careless of victory, manœuvred only for stale-mate. Hence the political results of Italian campaigns were inconsiderable, compared with the forces in the field, the time consumed, and the resources expended. Impoverished States were left without defenders, and even wealthy belligerents were liable to a sudden and immediate desertion by their hireling bands. Still more fatal were the moral effects upon the people. The feudal system rendered every occupier of the soil a soldier, ready to stand by his king and country; and it transmitted to more peaceful times "a bold peasantry, their country's pride," and best defenders. But it was otherwise with the brave spirits of the Ausonian commonwealth. They were bound to the banner of some privileged bandit, who served the best bidder, whilst the mass of the community became indifferent to a native land, for which they were never called upon to hazard life or limb. The stipendiaries fought for or against freedom, faith, country, and comrades; the citizens endured their outrages or purchased their mercy. In the end, the military were brutalised, whilst the civilians became enervated. The former were made venal, the latter cowardly. The master-mind of Machiavelli, after the French invasion of 1592-9, saw these mischiefs, and would have remedied them by his plan for a civil militia; but it was too late, and the degeneracy engrafted upon the national character of Italy by the condottiere system still cankers it to the core.' (Vol. i. p. 12.)

Who is to wonder that during the earliest days of this system Italy should have been afflicted with some of the worst of its petty tyrants? On the other hand, who is not to wonder, and to feel tenfold admiration, at princes who could be bred up in it, and yet become fathers of their people? For such, in one instance at least, we shall see to have been the case. A noble nature, it is true, becomes shocked by examples which would debase a common one. A son with a great mind, in spite of his wrong training, shall go counter to the habits of an evil father.

But the greatness itself is not the less observable and delightful.

The attainment of their highest rank by the Montefeltri was rendered ominous by the crimes and catastrophe of its possessor, who, if history says true, was a youthful monster. His name, which to an English ear sounds like a burlesque, and an apology for eccentricity, was Oddantonio (a compound of Antonio and Oddo, or Otho). This first Duke of Urbino, whose rank was given him by the Pope by way of soothing a refusal to a great vassal, appears to have crammed into the small space of his existence the lives of some dozen scoundrels. He was probably out of his wits. He had come prematurely to a great inheritance, and his faculties were perhaps overborne by the prosperity. His history carries us at one step into the midst of the splendours, the luxuries, and the horrors, which the imagination connects with the deepest Italian romance. Oddantonio succeeded at fifteen to his father's princely domains. Two years afterwards he is made Duke by the Pope, amidst the pomps of chivalry and religion. Meantime he riots in orgies of the most hideous description, becomes hated by all the husbands within distance, and commits a dreadful murder. In the summer of his seventeenth year, just before his own marriage, he attended the nuptials of his betrothed's brother, among festivals and pageants, and the slaughter of boars and bullocks; and three months afterwards he perished in a conspiracy on the part of those whom he had injured, and his body was loaded with indignities. The murder which he committed is related as follows, on the testimony of the Pope who crowned him:—‘He made one of his pages, who had neglected to provide lights at the proper hour, be enveloped in sear-cloth, coated with combustibles, and then, setting fire to his head, left him to the horrors of a lingering agony.’ (Vol. i. p. 50.)

The bare possibility of the truth of such a story is something appalling to humanity; yet who that has read the histories of tyrants and inquisitors shall say that it is impossible? When the will is suffered to grow enormous, it must have enormous satisfactions.

‘Next the dark night,’ says the poet, ‘comes the glad morrow.’ The first and worst Duke of Urbino was succeeded by the best; and, as his reign was longer and happier, we shall dilate upon it accordingly. His name was Federigo. Since the publication of Mr. Dennistoun's book, it is a name which will be known a great deal more than it was, and should become a favourite with posterity. Federigo was an elder brother of Oddantonio, born out of wedlock; a circumstance which, in those days of

contested successions, was considered no flaw in a scutcheon, especially if the bearer was a man fit to govern. Scandal said he was no son at all, at least not on the father's side; and there have been six other theories, most of them going to prove that he had no direct claim to the diadem. These, after centuries of dispute, Mr. Dennistoun has set at rest by the fortunate discovery of a document from Pope Martin the Fifth, conferring legitimation in due form. It is preserved in the Archivio Diplomatico at Florence, and declares his mother to have been a 'maiden of Urbino.' For some reason or other, however, most likely because his nominal lord the Pope was not pleased with his politics, Federigo succeeded his brother, not as Duke, but as Count,—the old title of the family; nor was he invested with the higher title till thirty years afterwards; and only then, it would seem, because his daughter married a nephew of Pope Sixtus the Fourth. The Popes were always hungering after the estates of their vassals;—if possible, as inheritances for their own families; if not, as encroachments for the church. At all events they were bent upon having them. The old saying, 'By hook or by crook,' singularly fitted these ecclesiastical neighbours. What their claw could not seize, their crozier abstracted.

Not, however, from a man like Federigo. And had his successors resembled him, they might have kept the title to this day. Making every allowance for the flatteries of courtiers, the pride of contemporaries, and the laudable enthusiasm of gratitude, Federigo di Montefeltro, second Duke of Urbino, was a man for whom every human being that becomes acquainted with him is bound to express his love and reverence. He himself was of a loving, a reverencing, and a thankful nature. He was a soldier, yet a lover of books; religious, but not bigoted; energetic, but superior to anger; severely tried, yet cheerful; voluptuous by temperament, but not by habit; a prince at once magnificent and paternal; a right gentleman and fellow-creature; above all, a man true to his word. We speak of that as his crowning virtue, because, not to compromise the truth of our history, but to give both him and others their due, he lived in what must be pronounced to have been an age of liars. The only thing held shameful, said Macchiavelli, was want of success. To succeed, that is to say, to obtain the sure and certain non-success of a criminal prosperity, every body (so to speak) lied, and cheated, and was guilty of the grossest perjuries. It is not to be supposed that, in times so unprincipled, the best man alive, early employed as a soldier and politician, and forced to plot as well as to contend, could have kept himself utterly free

from this objection. Yet, by the universal consent of the age, and to the astonishment of the cunning knaves in it who laughed at sincerity, and who nevertheless saw him prosper beyond them all, Federigo was so strong in the foundation of every virtue — good faith — that the only doubt which has been cast upon it by the jealousy of republican writers is, whether it was spotless.

But his conduct shall speak for itself. To praise a noble nature is delightful; but to see it in action, is more so. We will first give a brief sketch of his life.

Federigo had the good fortune to receive an excellent education, as far as one person could give it. His master understood the training both of mind and body. At eight years of age he was affianced (which was not so wise), and at fifteen he was married. He studied the art of war under Piccinino and Sforza, whose different systems of daring and caution he is said to have combined. He had long and successful contests with his neighbour, Sigismund Malatesta, a ferocious dilettante, who committed murders, and struck medals. He had also the honour of being excommunicated by Pope Eugene the Fourth for adhering to an unfortunate friend; became successively Captain-General of the Florentines, of the Duke of Milan, and of the King of Naples, the last of whom he delighted by his honesty; was then general in the service of the Church; refused to break his word with the most faithless of his enemies; built a splendid palace and library, and kept a stately court, which did not hinder him from mixing in the pleasantest manner with his people; was chosen commander of the first National Confederation, prototype of the measure so often since desired by Italians, and so invariably nullified by their divisions; helped to procure for his country, nevertheless, twenty-eight years of comparative tranquillity; attended with pomp the convocation of Pope Sixtus the Fourth, who invested him with the dukedom, and married a nephew to his daughter; received the order of the Garter from our Edward the Fourth, which, though truly fit for such a mirror of knighthood, was bestowed with an eye to his good offices with the Pope; indulged his love of scholarship and philosophy, and patronised art and science; rejected with scorn and horror a proposal to aid the Roman court in the assassination of Lorenzo di Medici and his brother, yet thought it no dishonour to conceal the plot from its objects, and to conduct troops against them for his papal employer; found himself, nevertheless, in a short time, fighting on the side of Lorenzo against papal encroachment; and on the 10th of September, in the year 1482, died of a fever, caught during the campaign, and rendered fatal by his refusal to quit his post.



This concealment of a plot to assassinate, seems to have been the only blot on the scutcheon of this admirable person. He could not, it is true, have disclosed the names of the plotters, who were his friends, but he ought surely to have warned the intended victims. One of them perished. Lorenzo survived to become the greatest man in Italy. It is pleasant to think that he and Federigo personally came together. As to the transference of services from one State to another on no consideration but profit and expedience, it was not only the allowed but the approved custom of the age, especially if there was no violation of confidence, and no desertion of a friend. It has in truth been the custom in all ages. But in those days, nicety on such points was reckoned absurd, and Federigo stood unique in his scruples. Every other prince and condottiere played his game like a cheat. He alone kept his cards above board; and by the brave identification of honesty with policy, swept off all the honours.

Federigo was eminently a gentleman. He had a large heart which could afford both to give and take; and he did the best things in the best manner. A Count Gian Francesco di Meleto, who, though properly a subject of his own, had sided with his enemies, and had always been his ill-wisher, was captured by his exasperated soldiers, and with difficulty rescued from their hands by Federigo himself. When the battle was over, the culprit and his son were summoned before him, and thus addressed: — 'Count, this will be evil news for your wife. It would be right to console her with tidings of your welfare, and her son's. It is, therefore, my pleasure that you convey them to her in your own persons.' And he dismissed them home with an escort. (Vol. i. p. 189.) 'His modesty,' says Mr. Dennistoun, 'equalled his merit.' Duke Galeazzo Maria Sforza having one day observed, 'Whenever I have fighting in hand, I should wish to keep by me your lordship, who, in my opinion, cannot be worsted;' he replied, 'I learned all that from his excellency the duke, your father.' (Id. p. 261.)

'He was most particular in the performance of justice, in acts as well as words. His master of the household having obtained large supplies for the palace from a certain tradesman, who had also many courtly creditors, and could not get paid, the latter was obliged to have recourse to the Duke, who said, 'Summon me at law.' The man was retiring with a shrug of his shoulders, when his lord told him not to be daunted, but to do what he had desired, and it would turn out for his advantage and that of the town. On his replying that no tipstaff could be found to hazard it, Federigo sent an order to one to do whatever this merchant might require for the ends of jus-

tice. Accordingly, as the Sovereign issued from his palace with his retinue, the tipstaff stood forward, and cited him to appear the next day before the podestà, on the complaint of such-a-one. Whereupon he, looking round, called for the master of his household, and said, in presence of the court, "Hear you what this man says? Now give such instructions as shall save me from having to appear from day to day before this or that tribunal." And thus, not only was the man paid, but his will was made clear to all,—that those who owed should pay, without wronging their creditors.

It having been represented to him that the fashion of going armed gave daily occasion for brawls and tumults, he made the podestà put forth a proclamation that no one should carry any weapon, and took care to be passing with his court when the crier was publishing it. Stopping to listen, he turned:—"Our podestà must have some good reason for this order, and, that being so, it is right he should be obeyed." He then, unbuckling his sword, gave it to one of his suite to be taken home, whereupon all the others did the same. Thus, by his example, he maintained more prompt and perfect justice than others could effect by sentences, bails, bonds, imprisonments, tortures, or the halter; and it was just when he made the least show of power that he was most a sovereign. One Nicolo da Cagli, an old and distinguished soldier in his service, having lost a suit, went to Fossombrone to lodge an appeal with Federigo, and, finding that he was hunting in the park, followed him, without ever considering that the time and place were ill-adapted for such a purpose. At the moment when he put his petition into his sovereign's hands, a hart went by with the hounds in full cry. The Count spurred after them, and in the hurry of the moment dropped the petition, which Nicolo taking as a personal slight, he retired in great dudgeon, and went about abusing him roundly, as unjust, ungrateful, and haughty. Federigo, hearing of this, ordered the commissary of Cagli to send the veteran to Urbino, who hesitated to obey the summons, dreading punishment of his rashness. In reliance, however, on his master's leniency and his own merits, he set out, and found the Count at breakfast in the great audience chamber. It was customary, while at meals, for those who had the *entrée* to fall back on each side, leaving the entrance clear, so that he saw Nicolo come; and when he had done eating, he called, and thus addressed him:—"I hear that you go about speaking much ill of me; and as I am not aware of having ever offended you, I desire to know what you have been saying, and of what you complain." At first he turned it off with some excuse; but, on being pressed for an explanation, he recounted what had occurred in the park; and that, considering his long and zealous service, his sacrifices and wounds, it appeared to him a slight, and virtually a cut direct, to run after a wild beast when he came in search of justice; that having, in consequence, let slip the opportunity of appealing, and so irretrievably lost a cause of much importance, he had in irritation given too much license to his tongue. Whereupon Federigo, turning to the bystanders, said, "Now see what obligations I am under to my subjects, who not only peril

'their lives in my service, but also teach me how to govern my "State!" and continued thus to the litigant: "Friend Nicolo, you are quite right; and since you have suffered from my fault, I shall "make it up to you." He then ordered the commissary of Cagli to pay him down the value of the house and all his travelling expenses, although the fault was clearly his for not bringing his appeal at a fitter time. Again, during one severe winter, the monks at St. Bernardine being snowed up, and without any stores, rang their bells for assistance; the alarm reaching Urbino, Federigo called out the people, and went at their head to cut a way and carry provision to the good friars.' (Vol. i. p. 268.)

There are minds so well constituted that, (like naturally graceful bodies unspoilt in the training, which are sure to fall into becoming attitudes,) they cannot be thrown out of their propriety by any mischance. A wooden balcony once breaking beneath him, and dashing him to the earth, so that his leg underwent a dangerous fracture, his first exclamation was, not one of confusion, or pain, or anger, but of gratitude that he had not lost his life. So, on a still worse occasion, when he received a blow between the eyebrows, which knocked out his right eye, and defaced his nose for life, he repaid with cheerful words the condolences of those who flocked round him, and showed them what a capital thing it was that he had an eye remaining. There is no surer mark of a vulgar nature, than its willingness to thrust pain upon others, in order to divert its own. Here was a man, whose only advantage taken of the sympathy which he deserved, was to keep all the pain to himself.

There is a profile of Federigo among Mr. Dennistoun's illustrations, which carries with it melancholy proof of its likeness in the disfigurement of the nose and eye. The expression is that of determined sense and manliness; and though the painter has been very properly suffered to take the seeing instead of the blind side of the face, the sitter has not allowed him to spare four or five warts with which it is sprinkled;—a magnanimity, we believe, which has been thought peculiar to Cromwell.

One more passage, and we have done; for we have four Dukes remaining.

'While at Urbino he daily repaired to the market-place, whither the citizens resorted for gossip and games, as well as for business, mixing freely with them, and joining in discourse, like one of themselves, sitting among them, or leaning on some one by the hand or arm. If in passing through the town he noticed any one building a house, he would stop to inquire how the work went on, encouraging him to beautify it, and offering him aid if required, which he gave as

well as promised. Should any answer him that, though desirous of making a handsome dwelling, he was frustrated by the refusal of some neighbour to part with an adjoining hovel at a fair price, Federigo sent for its obstructive owner, and urged him to promote the improvement of the city, kindly assisting to arrange a home for him elsewhere. On hearing that a merchant had suffered loss in his business, he would enter his shop to inquire familiarly into his affairs, and, after learning the extent of his difficulties, would advance him the means of restoring his credit and trade. Once, meeting a citizen who had daughters to marry, he said to him, "How are your family?"—"have you got any of your girls disposed of?" And being answered that he was ill able to endow them, he helped them with money or an appointment, or set him in some way of bettering himself. Indeed, such instances were numberless of his charitable and sympathising acts, among which were the numerous poor children of talent or studious tastes, whom he educated out of love for letters. On the death of those in his service, he took special interest in their families, providing for their maintenance or education, or appointing them to offices, and continually inquiring in person as to their welfare. When the people came forth to meet him as he went through his State, receiving him with festive demonstrations, he had for each a word. To one, "How are you?" to another, "How is your old father?" or, "Where is your brother?" to a third, "How does your trade thrive?" or, "Have you got a wife yet?" One he took by the hand; he put his hand on the shoulder of another; but spoke to all uncovered; so that Ottaviano Ubaldini used to say, when any person was much occupied, "Why, you have more to do than Federigo's bonnet!" Indeed, he often told the Duke that his cap was overworked, hinting that he ought to maintain more dignity with his subjects. Talking of his courtesy; when returning one day from Frossombone to Urbino, he met a bride being escorted to her husband by four citizens, as was then customary; he at once dismounted, and joined them in accompanying her and sharing in their festivities.' (Vol. i. p. 268.)

Adieu to noble Federigo; and thanks to Mr. Dennistoun for making us acquainted with him.

Guido Ubaldo, (or, as the Italians generally write it, Guidubaldo,) became third Duke of Urbino at the age of eleven. He was a worthy, but luckless son of his father. He was good, brave, learned, very handsome, and seemed to be very strong; and he trod entirely in his father's steps, till prevented by what looks like a burlesque on the metaphor; to wit, the gout. Such, at least, is the name given to his malady; though we suspect it to have been what would now be called acute rheumatism. It seized him in his seventeenth year; and after rendering the soldierly part of his life insignificant, killed him before he was forty. Guidubaldo received the Order of the Garter from Henry the Seventh, as his father had from

Edward the Fourth, and for the like reasons. During the usurpations of the infamous Pope Alexander the Sixth, he was twice driven from his dominions by the Pope's no less infamous son, Cæsar Borgia; which gives occasion to Mr. Dennistoun to repeat the history of that portentous family, and to enlist himself in the number of those, who, in opposition to Roscoe and others, think the worst they can of the female Borgia, Lucrezia;—a disposition, as it appears to us, neither so warranted by a knowledge of the times, nor so desirable for the interests of virtue, as the amount of their arguments, or even the tone of their indignation, would imply. There is sometimes a gusto of reprobation, which is not the best evidence of a wish to dispense with its necessity.

Federigo had been a patron of letters: had built, as we have observed, a splendid palace; and had collected, in emulation of the Medici, a library worthy of it; every book in which, we are told, was, by his express desire, bound 'in crimson and silver.' (Castiglione says, 'adorned with silver and gold;' and the variety looks more like the truth.) But the illustrious 'Captain-General' led too active a life to be as conversant with literature as his son, whose gouty chair seems to have attracted the visits of all the wits and poets of the nation, at the commencement of a period which has been called the Golden Age of Italian genius. We shall see, presently, who were among them. Whether they profited as much as they were honoured, we shall see, perhaps, also. At all events, there was a great deal of praise on both sides. The duke, when he could no longer take a part in the manly exercises of which he was as fond as of his reading, contented himself with looking at them from his windows, and conversing with his books and literati;—and when his infirmities compelled him to go to bed, which was at an early hour, the circle retired to the apartments of his duchess (Elisabetta Gonzaga), and there, after dances and music, continued the conversation, or amused themselves with ingenious devices. So informs us the writer just mentioned, Count Baddassare Castiglione; and through his means it is, that a lively interest, or any interest at all, attaches itself to the reign of the good Guidubaldo the First, Third Duke of Urbino. He and all that belong to him now depend for the attention we give them on one solitary volume, which his sickness occasioned, and which has left to posterity a picture of his court.

The distinguished author of this book, the *Cortegiano*, was of a noble family in Lombardy, and related, on the mother's side, to the princely house of Gonzaga. He was attached to Guidubaldo's person during the close of the duke's life; and he re-

mained with his successor, till vicissitudes in the ducal family took him back to his native country. He then became ambassador to Rome for the court of Mantua, and was ultimately nuncio from Clement the Seventh to the Emperor Charles the Fifth, at the period when the disastrous sack of Rome took place under the Constable Bourbon. The consequences of this 'untoward event,' and the complaints of Clement at his not having foreseen it (though there was, perhaps, not a man in existence to whom it was not equally unexpected), are supposed to have caused him so much chagrin, as to shorten his days. He died at Toledo in his fiftieth year, and was pronounced by Charles to have been 'one of the best knights in the world.' The Emperor had wished him to become his second in his proposed romantic duel with Francis the First.

As the long popularity of Castiglione's book, the repeated editions of it in other languages, its particular connexion with Urbino, and the effect it probably had on the rest of 'polite Europe,' naturally call upon us to speak of it at some length, we must here beg the reader to consider himself as loitering for a time at the court before us, going in and out of doors on its lofty terraces (it was a sort of Edinburgh in Italian highlands), and above all, accompanying us to the apartments of the Duchess Elisabetta, and joining the illustrious company, who are resting from the dance. The silver lamps have just been replenished; the statues are placidly smiling in front of the tapestries of cloth of gold; there steals into the room an odour of myrtle and orange; and the music of an unseen orchestra is slowly dying away, as if too happy to leave off.

On looking about us, we do not see Ariosto; which is a pity, for he knows the parties; but he has not yet come to his fame. Neither is Raphael here, for he is too busy at Rome (a picture of his has gone to England in return for the Order of the Garter). But here are gallant friends of Ariosto, — Gonzagas and Pallavicinis. Here is Ottaviano Fregoso, whom by the prophetic eye vouchsafed to visitors in our condition, we behold afterwards Doge of Venice. His brother Federigo is with him, who was afterwards Archbishop of Salerno (though you would not think it, to see his vivacity). Next him is the son of the great Lorenzo, — Giuliano de' Medici, — 'elegant and gentle.' And here is Pietro Monte, surnamed Terpander for his exquisite music; and Bernardo Accolti, called the Unique, for his improvisation; and Bernardo da Bibbiena, afterwards Cardinal, one of the founders of Italian comedy (for these priests were then the merriest gentlemen existing); and not to enumerate less distinguished persons, here is the renowned Bembo, after-

wards Cardinal also, whose letters to the fair Lucrezia are found to this day wrapped up with her golden hair in the famous library at Milan. We cannot help noticing, however, for the curiosity's sake, a friar, very stout and jovial, in his plain woollen dress, with the rope round his waist, one Brother Serafino, — a personage with an eye as little seraphical as possible, though it is often turned on the ladies. As to the ladies themselves, we are not sure that we are acquainted with more than two of them; one, the Duchess herself; and the other, the Lady Emilia Pia, her friend and favourite, widow of the Duke's brother Antonio. The ladies are not so numerous as the gentlemen; but they do not seem the less contented. The Lady Emilia, as usual, has been appointed president of the evening, to encourage or admonish the gentlemen, as the case may require: the whole company are seated indiscriminately, yet with a kind of orderly disorder; and the sweet majesty of the Duchess throws a mingled charm of delight and respectfulness over all.

The Duchess makes a sign to the Lady Emilia to begin, and the fair president desires the gentlemen to speak, and say what shall be the theme of the evening. Signor Gasparo Pallavicini, one of the Duke's captains, proposes accordingly, that every one should declare what kind of virtue they would most desire in the person they loved, and what kind of vice be most willing to excuse. Cesare Gonzaga, another soldier, is for the company's confessing what follies they were most subject to; which, he thinks, would greatly conduce to their respective self-knowledge, and thus, perhaps, help to 'save a soul.' The company are much amused at this proposal, and fall to confessing themselves immediately; but Friar Serafin interrupts them by observing, that such things as follies must needs be very long in the confessing. He, therefore, to the surprise of us northern visitors, proposes an equivocal subject; but the fair president puts it down by enjoining him silence, and the 'Unique' is called upon to speak instead. This singular gentleman, who is accused by some of making love to the Duchess, for the purpose of being thought to have more influence with her than he really possesses, first makes some remarks on hard-hearted Serpents and Sirens, and then, as if he meant to apply the initial of those words to his question, proposes that the company should declare their opinions respecting an ornament in the shape of the letter S, which the Duchess wears on her forehead. Nothing comes of this but a sonnet, which he extemporises; and Ottaviano Fregoso then proposes, that every gentleman should declare on what ground of objection it would least pain him to find his

addresses to a lady refused. He has heard, he says, of things called 'sweet disdains,' and he would fain learn what they are. Bembo is for limiting the question to the choice, between real faults on the lover's side, and mistaken imputations of them on the part of the lady. The president, however, is still unsatisfied, and passes the word to Fregoso's brother, who finally settles the difficulty by proposing for discussion the requisites of an accomplished courtier. The opening of the debate is assigned to Count Ludovico da Canossa (afterwards Bishop of Baieux), who on Gonzaga's recommending adjournment to next day, in order to give the speaker 'time to think,' pleasantly declines the accommodation, for fear of resembling the jumper, who, 'on stripping himself to his waistcoat, got over less ground than he did in his coat.'

We need not repeat the requisites in question. They amount to some four score; for not a shadow of qualification is omitted. The aspirant is of course to be a paragon of a gentleman, the Crichton or Sir Charles Grandison of his day. Bibbiena is chief jester in the argument; Pallavicini, consistently with his severity on the fair sex, is the confiner of love to gallantry; and to Bembo is assigned the belief in love sentimental. The discussion occupies three more evenings; and its close is wound up by a really beautiful aspiration on the part of Bembo, and by the discovery (which as beautifully fits it) of the morning light through the shutters; the company having been so wrapped up in their subject, that they forgot the hours, and thought it was still night.

In Castiglione's book a fair counterpart is provided for his Court-gentleman in an equally consummate Court-lady. The reader may guess her perfections. Both lady and gentleman are very unlike those of Chesterfield, with whom, as a writer, the Count has been compared: much to the Italian's wrong; for, with all his mistakes, Castiglione was a manly and good man, and would equally have disdained the importance which the other attaches to trifles and the solemn foppery of his never condescending to laugh. But it must not be concealed, as an evidence how far a good and high-minded man, naturally beyond his time, may be injured by it, that with all his love of truth and delicacy the Count has not escaped so well as Duke Federico from the infection of the trickeries he beheld around him, or even from the coarseness of the Condottieri soldiers. To say nothing of such things as puns and cross-purposes, which the court of Elizabeth admired, and which are eulogised in the *Cortegiano*, the reader is surprised to find how much raillery and horse-play is permitted to the gentlemen and ladies of the



court of Duke Guidubaldo, even to the unhandsomest practical joking. Chesterfield would have triumphed over this. But he would have been equally pleased to see the Count's gentleman allowed to mix up a good deal of expediency with his veracity; and this, too, not unwillingly, or only upon perilous and perplexing occasions, but for the small purpose of being thought better of on little ones. He must not pretend openly to any virtue or accomplishment which he does not possess; but, on the white-lie principle, he may allow such conclusions to be drawn; nay, take measures to procure them. His 'music,' at the same time, though he is to play it well, he is to play but condescendingly, as if he did it by constraint. He is to take pains to show that he has taken no pains. He is to refuse honours and other favours, for the purpose of having them pressed upon him. In short, paragon of truth as he is, he is to practise a great deal of the *magis videri quam esse*, the sacrifice of truth to pretension. He is also not a little to despise the common people. His very highest motive is to be 'Honour;' that is, to be thought well of, and to be distinguished. There is not a word of patriotism, much less of the welfare of mankind: and though nobody (except in horse-play and mystification) is to be personally offended, particularly the ladies, the conversation is repeatedly allowed to trespass on their indulgence. Things are talked of, which could not even be hinted at now; and with an inconsistency not uncommon to books that teach manners, others are without necessity related, in order to show that no such things should be mentioned.\* Time was not yet ripe for the Steeles and Addisons, nor even for resolutions like Mrs. Godolphin's,—not to smile, though the gentlemen talked filthily. The Reformation itself had not appeared; nor Papal courts grown serious, except when they were plotting. The very best people in those days had no suspicion that some things were wrong, which are now thought so, whatever might be said against them by the priests. The priests in truth said very little, especially as the Bible was not read; and what they did say, they were the first to laugh at. Not only men, therefore, but ladies of the very highest reputation, made no scruple of talking with the priests on the subject, and echoing the mirth. Mr. Dennistoun has spoken highly, and, we have no doubt, justly, of the two principal ladies recorded in the Count's book, and equally eulogised by himself, the Duchess of Urbino and

---

\* There are two, if not more, translations of the *Cortegiano* in English, the latest of which is the least objectionable on the score alluded to.

the Lady Emilia, her friend. He thinks them superior to the talk which they heard around them; or, at least, that they were not the sort of people to take a part in it. He speaks in particular of the Duchess's 'own pure example.' (Vol. ii. p. 42.) Yet, to say nothing of his own denouncements of the age in other places, its priests, ladies, and all, there is a book still popular in Italy — the Novels of Bandello — in which the sedatest personages in the *Cortegiano* cut a remarkable figure. One story, which no gentleman would think of telling to ladies now, is told to the author of the *Cortegiano* himself, on purpose that he should repeat it to his wife; a second is told to Bandello by a lady, on purpose that he should tell it to the world; and a third, which Mr. Dunlop, in his 'History of Fiction,' pronounces to be the most indecent 'in the whole series of Italian novels,' is related in the presence of 'Madamà di Mantua,' and of the two Duchesses of Urbino, reigning and dowager, one of whom was the very Duchess whose example is so pure.

We have been the more particular in this matter, by way of caution to those biographers, who, while thinking the best of persons to whom they are well disposed, do not scruple to think the worst of others when it pleases them to do so, and this too on the strength of those very manners which, in the case of the former, they adduce in extenuation. Lucrezia Borgia had the misfortune of being born in a wicked family; yet, if all the arguments in her favour by Roscoe, and all the terms of respect and admiration in which she was spoken of by contemporaries who knew her, Ariosto included, are to go for nothing, because she was present with that family at scandalous spectacles (perhaps upon compulsion, — at all events, with the sanction of a father who was counted the viceregent of heaven), what becomes of the pure example of the Duchess of Urbino, who could listen to the most indecent of Italian novels? No worse, of course, than we must think of the whole age, and of its gravest ornaments; but then, the poor daughter of the bad pope should partake the benefit of their countenance. The story in question is represented as told by the famous Navagero, the Latin poet, one of the most respectable of men; and it is addressed to Amanio, who was a judge, by Bandello, who was a bishop.

We all know how coarse and indecent, in a later day, were the writings of Pope, the favourite of the circles, and of Swift, who was a dean. Witness also the *Suffolk Correspondence*, in respect to the talk of ladies; to say nothing of what has transpired of a later generation, and which is quoted at this moment

in periodical papers, not only with indulgence, but with glee. Though Afra Behu is now banished, our own age, perhaps, will not be thought so pure as it fancies itself, or so good as it really is, when coming generations read of all that it tolerates, and even admires. Readers might be startled out of their propriety, if we asked them what they thought, on reflection, of some of their gravest customs. There are foreigners who would certainly have no mercy on us. Look at a Turkish or Persian gentleman at one of our *soirées*, where the best and wisest of the land are assembled. Think how he keeps his own females from the company of men, and how he muffles them up to the eyes in public; and then fancy what he might think of our wives and sisters, upon the strength of their unsuspecting faces, their certainly *not* muffled up bosoms, and the clothes which seem to be slipping down their backs. Yet he knows very well, or would soon be taught, if necessary, what would be the consequence of his venturing to breathe an indecent word into the ear of one of the charming wearers.

Not that we are to conceive as highly of the morals or manners of Italy in those days, as we are of English ones at present. That would be as ridiculous, as to constitute our own customs the standard of all which are to come. There is too much that needs pardon in all ages. Only it is as well to be impartial in supposing as much goodness as we can, where there is no positive proof to the contrary.

We have been led into a long account of one of the particulars connected with the court of Duke Guidubaldo; but it was out of zeal to do our best for the reader. We hope the company which he has met with, have helped to warrant us; and shall now proceed to bring the rest of the Dukes to his acquaintance. They are a curious race, and will not let him slumber.

Francesco Maria della Rovere, successor to Guidubaldo, and Fourth Duke of Urbino, was the son of Giovanni della Rovere, nephew of Pope Sixtus the Fourth, and brother of Pope Julius the Second, by Giovanna di Montefeltro, daughter of Duke Federigo. It is thus that the dukedom passed into the Della Rovere House, giving rise to the second and concluding dynasty. Francesco Maria was an extraordinary person. He was famous for two things; delay in fighting battles, and promptitude in committing personal outrages. In private intercourse, it was a word and a blow with him: in his conduct of armies his maxim was, delays are safe. Mr. Dennistoun urges what he can for the duke on both these points; and thinks that Guicciardini and other historians have been hard on him.

With how much good-nature, the reader may judge from the following little incidents.

In the seventeenth year of his age, Francesco Maria commences his career by assassinating the paramour of his sister. At twenty-one, he assassinates a cardinal in open day, and in the precincts of the Vatican. Fifteen years afterwards, so little had experience taught him, he knocks down Guicciardini himself at a war-council with a blow on the face, telling him that pedants were the men for him to converse with, and bidding him 'get up and be gone.' This was for differing with him in opinion. Guicciardini, besides being the man which posterity know him to have been, was at that time Papal commissioner, or lieutenant-general, with powers almost as great over the duke's army as the Duke himself. This may have been very irritating; but the duke's delays and brutalities were no less so. Two years afterwards, while in the act of departing from Venice, where the republic had mortified him, his attendants, being challenged by three of the patrol for riding armed, answered them by beating them to death. And many days had not elapsed, when an officer of the republic having 'somewhat 'disrespectfully' (the officer, perhaps, might have told us otherwise,) 'combated his opinion concerning the defence of Perchiera, 'received from him a severe blow in the face, tearing it with a 'diamond ring which he happened to wear, which was followed 'by a severe beating with his baton of command.' A biographer adds, that 'it was well for him the duke was unarmed.' But 'such pugilistic sport,' observes the same writer, when speaking of the treatment of Guicciardini, was 'habitual to my 'lord duke; and it was well for those who could command 'their temper in reasoning with him, as he was ever ready to 'strike any one who argued against his views with disrespect.' Disrespect! A man who was given to arguments like these was as little likely to be a proper judge of respect, as he was to maintain or deserve it. They do not leave him unjustly suspected even of cowardice. A man of a brutal temper is not, of necessity, a coward; but when he takes advantage of his rank to beat and assassinate, the case looks very like it.

We need not enter into further details respecting this bully. Like his predecessors, he was employed in the service of other princes as a military leader, sometimes with success, not seldom with failure, owing to his habits of delay, which Mr. Dennistoun acknowledges to have been occasionally suspicious and unaccountable. Nepotism, the scandal of the Roman Church, and not of the Roman only, was now in full action; and Francesco Maria, like others whom it brought into power, suffered as well as pro-

fited by it. The Borgias had endeavoured to kidnap him when a boy, in order to hinder his succession to the Duchy; and Leo the Tenth would have ousted him from its possession, to give it to his own family. He does not appear, after all, to have been a bad sovereign. Even assassins must have justice done to them. Nor should it be forgotten, that every crime in those days was encouraged by absolution from popes.

Guidubaldo the Second, fifth Duke of Urbino, styled by his subjects Guidubaldaccio (Despicable Wretch Guido), inherited the irritability of his father Francesco without his violence. The native part of the Condottiere system was now over, and two events only are recorded of the reign of this prince,—one a quarrel which he had with his subjects, originating in his want of money, and his wish to extort it; the other, a movement on the part of his duchess, the importance of which may be gathered from the following historical document:—

‘ Master Steward, our well-beloved,

‘ This is to inform you, that on your return with his Excellency, our lord and consort, you must bring with you as much of the finest and most beautiful scarlet serge, such as is made on purpose for the cardinals, as may suffice to make us a petticoat.’

Guidubaldaccio died of a quartan fever at the age of sixty, and was succeeded by his son Francesco Maria the Second, then a youth of five and twenty.

Among the curiosities of his dynasty, Francesco Maria the Second, sixth and last Duke of Urbino, was not the least. He had been married, when prince, to Donna Lucrezia d'Este, sister of Alfonso, the last Duke of Ferrara; a union which, in some memoirs of himself which he left in manuscript, he describes as not having been much to his taste, ‘ for she was old enough to have been his mother.’ She was thirteen years older. A Venetian observer adds, that she was ‘ below par in good looks, but well dressed.’ What different accounts of people are given by prose and poetry! This is one of the two famous sisters, Lucrezia and Leonora, upon whose beauty such rapturous verses were written by Tasso, and of whom it has been doubted with which of them he was in love. Tasso, whose father had been a *protégé* of the Duke's father, and who had been partly brought up in company with the son, followed the wife of his former associate to Urbino; and Mr. Dennistoun intimates that the domestic peace of the couple may have been endangered. Be this as it may (and he says that neither then, nor afterwards, did the Duke betray any jealousy of the poet, or treat him with anything but regard), the couple lived but a

few years together. Lucrezia returned to the gayer court of her brother ; and her husband, after leading for some years the life of a sportsman, shut himself up during the long remainder of his days, with his books, his horses, his gout, and the cold Spanish manners which he had grafted on the family irritability. He thrust off the cares of government upon boards and councils, and even upon a foolish boy. He dictated to them, nevertheless, the items of their conduct ; chose to take the execution of his directions for granted, in order to save himself trouble ; was forced to resume his place and office by the poor boy's death ; made arrangements with the Church for transferring the Duchy into its hands ; and showed his jealousy, to the last moment, of a change which he was nevertheless anxious to facilitate. In short, Francesco Maria the Second was a selfish pedant, imitating 'in little' the abdication of Charles the Fifth, and loving power while he hated its cares.

The fate of his son—the poor boy alluded to—presents a strange and melancholy climax to the fortunes even of this strange and melancholy house. His father being a fool, the son naturally went counter to his directions : but the son, being unfortunately a fool also, became a proof of the old maxim, and only ran into vices the opposite of those of the father. He was a premature profligate ; an associate with stable boys and strolling players ; an actor on the stage himself, not as a hero or a gentleman, but as a buffoon, delighting in the lowest characters ; and, after taking a wife, as if on purpose to insult her by the ostentation with which he kept a mistress, he died at eighteen years of age, of the debauchee's *coup de grace*, a fit of apoplexy. The poor child's name was Federigo : 'Alas, how changed from *him!*' Mr. Dennistoun claims for his whole series of Dukes of Urbino, with the exception of the first, the praise of mild government and of a flourishing community, superior to those of Italy in general ; and we think he has made out his case. The sovereigns were enriched by external military employment ; the sequestered and mountainous nature of the country helped to secure it against invasion ; and, besides the rich agriculture of their valleys, the natives had a good stock of wealth in their trade and commerce.

At the close of the dukedom, they exported silks, woollen, leather, and majolica ; and they realised a large balance over their imports. They had flourished thus, more or less, for two hundred years ; and they have now, for the same space of time, been equally the reverse of flourishing, under the Popes. We recommend that 'distinguished' fact to the reader's reflections. He has seen and heard enough of Popes lately to enable him to

do it justice. If we have said little of the prosperity of the Urbinese, it is because it was the result rather of local circumstances than of the characters of its princes. Federigo was an exception; and (those circumstances considered) what he did was too well done to lose its effect, even under successors less worthy. But the patronage of talent was a fashion throughout Italy; and granting, for the sake of argument (for thorough justice to our subject compels us to state the doubt), that literature flourished better at Urbino than elsewhere, and that the majority of its dukes were the patrons they are supposed to have been, the fact has little to do with the country's prosperity. The peasants ploughed, and the merchants trafficked; but the natives, upon the whole, were a sombre race for Italians; and the district neither read other people's books, nor produced any authors to speak of. The palace (with the exception of pictures for churches) was all in all as the abode of taste; and it is questionable, notwithstanding the pleasing visions of accomplished court circles and occasional residents, how far men of letters were permanently better off at Urbino than elsewhere. They came and went, as at other places; stayed longer perhaps occasionally, and were received with more cordiality; but what great name, or second great name, or any name at all, has life-long connexion with its history? Ariosto was only a visitor; Tasso was only a visitor; Castiglione himself was not re-invited; Raphael was suffered to bloom elsewhere; Galileo once 'passed through the country.' Men of genius are grateful; and there are patrons who have deserved their gratitude, for they have given as much comfort as they have received glory. But, with the exception of the Medici, to how many other rulers among their countrymen, princely or republican, can praise like that be given? Perhaps to the Polentas, in the case of Dante; perhaps to the Colonnas, in that of Petrarch. Certainly to very few others, even in cases equally solitary. Florence, as a republic, did nothing to speak of for her greatest children. Of Petrarch she knew little; and Dante she exiled. Venice patronised painting, which is a semi-sensual luxury and a marketable commodity; but Titian could have done without her. Genoa patronised nobody. The chief celebrities at the Court of Urbino, the Bembo's, Bibbiena's, and others, were such as had resources elsewhere; and those who had to be paid, probably had the same complaints to make as were made at Ferrara, of difficulty to get the money. All the courtliness of Castiglione did not render him an exception. (See vol. ii. p. 47.) Art and science flourished most; art, for the reason just mentioned, and for the magnificence of building;

science, for its application to warfare. The patrons of Ariosto at Ferrara were studying cannon-founding to no purpose, while the man who immortalised them was neglected by their treasurer, and insulted by themselves. And what has genius experienced of late years in Italy but imprisonment and exile? The genius has flourished, it is true, whatever was the case with the man; for Italy is a land of genius, and its fruits will grow on the unworthiest of soils; but it is time that there should be an end to the talk about Italian princes and Italian patronage, compared with those of other countries. Louis the Fourteenth, with all his faults, did more for genius, than nine tenths of the princes of Italy; and we suspect that if the histories of our own British 'Dukes' were written, though they are no princes at all except in the herald's office, they would be found as far to exceed the Dukes of Urbino in princeliness of patronage, as in services (with one exception) to their country, and the diffusion of elegance and good manners. Italy is a beautiful and wonderful country; and we shall never cease to be interested in hearing of it, especially if it become happy. But even the addition of a Duke Federico to our stock of acquaintance cannot but make us wish that biographers would travel more at home, and show us what 'houses' our own island has possessed, to glorify and delight us.

---

ART. III.—1. *The Seven Lamps of Architecture.* By JOHN RUSKIN. London: 1848.

2. *The Stones of Venice.* Volume the First. 'The Foundations.' By JOHN RUSKIN. With Illustrations drawn by the Author. London: 1851.

IT is not usual to bring up young men as painters, sculptors, or composers of music, unless it is supposed that they have uncommon talents for painting, sculpture, or composition; but Architecture is seldom treated with such consideration. A father has four sons, feels that 'variety is charming,' and educates one for a lawyer, another for a soldier, a third for a physician, and, if he has too much conscience to make a clergyman of the fourth, who appears to have no 'call' that way, he resolves to make an architect of him, and does not entertain any misgiving, but that instruction, industry, and average general ability are capable of securing success in all the professions alike. Architecture and architects are no worse, and no better, than, under this condition, we ought to expect them



to be. The art which (to judge by the paucity of its successful cultivators) requires, perhaps more than any other fine art, a peculiar faculty in its votary, sinks, in the hands of a man not so qualified, into the rank of the mere useful arts,—none the less surely because certain systems of eminently useless decoration are attached to its exercise. It is not only in the matter of education that we show a practical disbelief, at present, of its being the duty of an architect to be anything more than what his name—literally Chief of the Works—implies him to be. Men who have acquired a considerable standing as architects make open admission of the entirely ‘professional’ nature of the art as they practise it. Mr. Joseph Gwilt, for example, says, that an architect is a ‘person competent to design and superintend the erection of any building;’ adding, that an architect’s qualifications are the instructions contained by his ‘Encyclopædia,’ and that a thorough grounding in these, together with ‘devotedness, faithfulness, and integrity towards his employer, with kindness and urbanity to those whose lot it may be to execute his projects, will ensure a *brilliant* and ‘happy career in his profession.’ Perhaps it would be well, since the necessities of a civilised and populous State require the services of architecture in Mr. Gwilt’s sense of the word, that the *fine* art—the art which divided with painting the affections of Giotto, Michel Angelo, Da Vinci, and Raffaello, and produced the Greek temple, the Gothic abbey, and the Venetian palace,—should go by some other name. So far is technical knowledge from being the main requisite,—so indispensable is genius to the practice of architecture as a Fine Art,—that the most consummate skill and learning which can be taught or acquired are of little worth in the absence of ‘the faculty divine.’ Sir Christopher Wren thought the great Pointed style barbarous, and knew not so much of its details as is at present known, of them by every young lady with a turn for ecclesiastical antiquities; nevertheless, there is an amount of true Gothic character in his attempts in this style, such as is rarely to be met with in the modern village churches which crowd our metropolis, and for every moulding, crocket, and corbel-head of which the architects can allege unquestionable authority in ancient examples.

Mr. Ruskin’s works, written in a highly popular and attractive style, among other good services, will do much towards elevating the common notions of architectural art: He is, however, frequently fanciful and extravagant, besides there being, in professional, as well as popular views, now prevalent, certain fundamental delusions concerning architecture, which his works,

—original and, in many respects, valuable, as they are,—seem fitted rather to confirm than to dissipate.

Writers on architecture generally agree in classifying architectural details under two heads, specified, according to the notions of the critic, the mechanical and the artistical, the useful and the beautiful, the constructive and the decorative, and so forth; few, however, seem to be agreed, either with others or themselves, as to the point at which the constructive ends and the decorative begins. In the first instalment of 'The Stones of Venice,' Mr. Ruskin has made an elaborate, and, in some respects, a successful attempt to trace the working of the constructive element, in various details which are commonly held to be chiefly or entirely decorative; he has also put forth certain general views of decoration, the full development and illustration of which are intended to form the contents of the concluding volume. An attentive perusal of 'The Foundations' has served to convince us that Mr. Ruskin's ideas upon this subject require considerable modification; and we venture to hope that the forthcoming part of the work, unless it is already in an advanced stage of preparation, may have its utility increased by the adoption into its system of certain widely practised, but hitherto imperfectly examined architectural principles, which shall be stated, and briefly explained, in the course of the following pages.

Of the two great and acknowledged elements of architecture, considered as a Fine Art, the mechanical element only has been sufficiently, or, indeed, at all deeply and systematically investigated. The constructive history of architecture has now been well nigh exhausted. As a popular outline of this subject, Mr. Hope's book left little to be desired, and the details have been amply filled up by the labours of professed architects. But it has not been possible to ignore one half of the art, or to attempt to do so without falling into serious error concerning the other half. The notion has arisen, and it appears still to be gaining ground, that, if the architect takes good care of the useful, the beautiful will take care of itself. New constructional necessities and discoveries have been asserted, by architectural critics of respectable standing, to have constituted, not only the germ, but the whole essence and form of each new phase of architectural character; and our best authorities afford examples of many confused and self-contradictory statements, in which the nature of decoration, and all that relates to *effect*, are treated as wholly subordinate to, and exponential of, constructive obligations. This misconception—for such we shall prove it to be—has been the re-action of the opposite and far

more pernicious error of regarding all decoration as arbitrary, unmeaning, and independent of construction. The error prevailed for centuries, and originated and completed the decay of every great style of architecture; it hid the discharging arch above the Roman doorway, with the falsehood of the sculptured architrave; it began the destruction of the Pointed style by the introduction of intersecting tracery lines; it brought about, by an easy gradation from forms either insignificant or unnatural, the ruinous contradiction of imitated materials, giving to Raffaello's Pandolfini Palace its cornice of perishable wood; it blinded the architects of the Cinque-cento manner in England and France to the absurdity of facing Gothic masses with spectral reminiscences of Greek details; and it has received its final glorification in the plaster splendours of London slop-shops and gin-palaces.

We believe that it is demonstrably wrong to regard the leading transitions of architectural style as having consisted wholly, or even mainly, in the fulfilment of new constructional necessities, and the effects to the eye, as having been no more than the simple, unforeseen, and unintended sequences. Constructional change, as an unavoidable condition to great novelties of effect, must have preceded such novelties in order of time. But who will venture on the absurdity of maintaining, for example, that the prodigious height of the naves of Beauvais and Cologne, and still more that of the spires of Salisbury and Strasburg, sprang from any necessities in the new construction, instead of the success and establishment of the new construction being chiefly owing to its capacity for producing this and other visual effects, which remained impossible till the round arch shot up into the lancet, and the ponderous masses of Roman and Lombard wall dissolved into the fairy framework of windows and buttresses? The very birth of the Pointed style seems to have been owing to the purely artistical element of architecture, to the desire for loftiness and magnificence, for their own sakes, and not to any incapacity of the preceding style for the fulfilment of all ordinary purposes of church-building.

We readily admit, as an important principle, perhaps the most important principle of architecture, that the peculiar artistical expression in every great and pure style, as the Egyptian, Greek, Lombard, Moresque, and Northern Pointed,—and, in an inferior degree, the mixed expression of less perfect styles, as the Roman, early Byzantine, Venetian-Gothic, and Cinque-cento, is always in a peculiar and harmonious relation with the manner of construction adopted. It is in every case an expres-

sion which could not be obtained, legitimately, under any other condition of construction. The law of the construction may be regarded as the theme of the architectural harmony; but its illustration is no such straightforward and prosaic business as Mr. Ruskin, and certain excellent architects, who are excellent in spite of the defects of their theories, would have us believe. These defects, in most cases, perhaps, consist rather in the statement than in the feeling of the truth, which, in the fewest words, appears to be this;—every kind of construction, when carried out in the simplest manner, is productive of some peculiar expression, which may or may not be one and the same with the truth of construction. Thus, the literal fact of the balance of supporting and supported members is the natural expression of the unadorned Greek ‘hut;’ and this expression, heightened immeasurably in emphasis, by means at which we shall presently glance, is the fundamental expression of the Erechtheion and the Parthenon. Again, the semblance of ascendant energy, which is a violent contradiction of the literal truth of stones and mortar, is the unassisted expression of the nave walls rising out of the aisle-roofs, in the barest of the ‘temporary churches’ on the outskirts of London. This expression was seized on by the inventors of the Northern Pointed, and was repeated, and heightened, and illustrated by them in a hundred different ways. The Lombard architects, who built according to the same leading form, which was that of the Roman basilica, wanted the groined roof, the pointed arch, and the buttress system, and were consequently greatly limited in the power of developing its chief fundamental expression; they therefore devoted themselves, like the early Greek architects, to emphasising, by various appeals to the imagination, the simple constructive truth. Walls of enormous and uniform thickness were required to support the arched roof; and, accordingly, the power of the wall is the theme of a most interesting and elaborate system of decoration. The Romans made an attempt to develop a system of expression out of a construction based upon the semicircular arch: they almost wholly failed. The attempt was renewed by the Byzantines, with little better success. It was reserved for the Arabian architects to found upon the mechanical properties of the arch an expression which emulated, and even surpassed, the Northern Gothic in the extent of its departure from obvious constructive reality. The Egyptian builder continually laboured to give expression to that preponderance of mass, the existence of which was a condition imposed upon him by his materials and his want of science in using them. The architecture of the

Renaissance, in its best monuments, confuses, rather than reconciles, the three principles of the wall, the arch, and the entablature. Other styles are modifications, combinations, or degradations of these, and respectively owe their claims to be regarded as styles to their development of one or more of these orders of natural expression.

In the following remarks, then, it will be our main object to show, that in every true style of architecture there are many details which should be classed as *means of architectural expression*,—a phrase which seems preferable to the term ‘*decoration*,’ or ‘*ornament* ;’ for these words convey to most persons the notion of something more or less extraneous, or detachable, and they fail to include features which, nevertheless, decidedly refuse to be classed under the head of constructional necessities. The want of a full recognition of this order of details has been the source of an immense amount of misapprehension and confusion among architects and writers on architecture. By the architects of the Renaissance, and by their successors down to the beginning of the present century, the means of architectural expression, in the ancient styles, were treated as arbitrary ornaments ; and some of the best writers of our own time, who have perceived this error, have themselves erred in the opposite direction, not less widely because much less dangerously, by regarding, or endeavouring to regard, the class of details in question, either as the ultimate fulfilments, or as the artistic exponents, of a merely constructive perfection.

A good deal of vagueness and timidity is necessarily manifest in the declarations of most writers upon this matter. Mr. Pugin’s well-known maxim, for example, sounds much more simple and satisfactory before, than after, a little consideration of its terms :—‘ I. That there should be no features about a building which are not necessary for convenience, construction, or propriety. II. That all ornaments should consist of the enrichment of the essential construction of the building.’ The truth or falsehood of the first statement depends entirely upon the latitude in which the word ‘*propriety*’ is taken. Artistical propriety would, we conceive, include much which would be excluded by barely utilitarian propriety. The second rule asserts one of the *conditions* of ornament, but as a definition of ornament it is totally worthless, on account of the indefinite and inadequate meaning of the word ‘*enrichment*.’ Insufficient as this declaration appears to be, it is perspicuity itself when compared with the definitions of some architectural critics. Mr. Ruskin, however, in the ‘*Stones of Venice*,’ is bold and

clear enough; vagueness and pusillanimity of affirmation are not among the charges which we shall have to make against his new volume. He states his principles broadly and simply at the outset, and then gives detailed applications of them; praising, as good architecture, all that agrees with them; and overwhelming with unmitigated, and often very eloquent scorn, whatever constitutes a departure from them. There is no mistaking his data, nor, if these are admitted to be the truth, and *the whole truth*, is there any denying his conclusions. Now, because some of Mr. Ruskin's leading principles are, in the main, the same which Mr. Pugin\*, and other influential writers besides himself, have enunciated, though with less distinctness, and have maintained, though commonly with far less boldness and consistency, we conceive that we may be rendering good service to architecture, by a somewhat detailed demonstration of certain weak points in the critical system expounded in 'The Stones of Venice.' We shall glance briefly at each of the great styles of architecture above enumerated, regarding them not from the constructive point of view, from which nothing fresh is to be seen, nor under the aspect of their peculiar decoration, understanding by this term what Mr. Ruskin, and most critics who have spoken at all plainly on the subject, seem to understand by it, namely, sculptured and painted imitations of natural and artificial objects, chosen and executed for the sake of an interest, which may be more or less appropriate in character, but of which the character is not altogether destroyed by detachment from the architecture. By considering in each style its properly architectural expression, and the means by which this has been obtained, we may be enabled, not only to add our mite to the existing stock of architectural criticism, but also to increase the practical worth of that stock, by rendering more definite than heretofore its real extent and signification. On our way, we hope to justify the Greek and Northern Gothic architects, and shall, in part, excuse those of

---

\* We are somewhat surprised to find Mr. Ruskin speaking in terms of unmixed wrath against Mr. Pugin. We sympathise quite as little as he does with that gentleman's rapturous visions of the ideal temple, where the 'albs hang in the oaken ambries, and the 'cofe chests are filled with orphreyed baudekins; and pix, and pax, and chrismatory are there, and thurible and cross!' &c. &c.; but it seems to us that Mr. Pugin has been long, diligently, and not without success, calling for the introduction into architectural practice of some of the very principles upon which Mr. Ruskin lays most stress. In which case, this precursorship might be considered as constituting a claim to more merciful treatment.

the Renaissance from some of the overwhelming charges which Mr. Ruskin has brought against them; and we trust that, before we conclude, our readers may have arrived at a clear understanding of a principle of great practical importance, as well to the production of works of architectural art as to the formation of a right judgment concerning them: We cannot, however, claim priority, even for the statement, much less for the perception of this principle: could we have done so, we should not have entertained our present bold conviction of its value. Its workings must have been felt by most persons as constituting a great part of the delight which they have received from architecture; and its existence has been repeatedly acknowledged, or assumed, in architectural criticism, though nearly always with a strange misappreciation of the extent and importance of its operations. F. Kugler, in his '*Handbuch der Kunstgeschichte*' (a book which ought to be translated into English), and Mr. Freeman, in his '*History of Architecture*,' have shown clear apprehensions of the source of architectural expression in a few of the details of Greek temple architecture: and some of the curious methods by which the Northern Gothic obtains the effect of ascendant energy, are become matters of ordinary criticism. The merit we mean to claim, is simply that of having shown, in something like its true breadth and depth, the working of a law, which is so paramount and universal, as almost always to have won for itself a dim recognition, even from critics whose theories have tended to persuade them, as far as possible, to overlook its existence.

To begin chronologically with Egypt: the effect of enormous massiveness, and of everlasting stability, is what first strikes, and to the last chiefly impresses, the beholder of her architectural forms. Massiveness in excess would necessarily characterise the original works of unpractised and unscientific builders in stone. It must be some time before the greatest length, with the least thickness of shaft and lintel, consistent with security, could be experimentally ascertained. The first builders would keep well on the safe side; and the unsought result, under almost any condition of construction, would be a high degree of that expression which distinguishes Egyptian architecture above every other style. Indian cavern architecture, and early Doric, for example, exhibit this superfluous massiveness; so that a careless observer would be likely enough to describe them as having an Egyptian look: there is, however, a wide difference in the way in which this fact of superfluous massiveness and its expression were dealt with by the three kinds of architects. The Egyptian designer was pre-

pared, by his national culture, to be pleased, not only with the reality, but also with the ostentation of a capacity in his work for endless duration; and his associations and sympathy with ideas of material power must have found simple and lively echoes in the ponderous bulks of his earliest monuments. He would retain and seek to increase the expression which thus, in all probability, at first arose from defective science. It is true that he may, from the beginning, have foreseen, with 'the prophetic eye' of the artist, the visual effects of building with blocks, and in forms of excessive massiveness; but whether he did so or not is a question which it would scarcely concern us to determine, even were it possible to do so; and in the existing state of information, we prefer the simpler and more probable belief. The Doric architect, prepared by a different and better culture to receive delight from ideas of correspondence and moderation, would hasten to rid his architectural forms of every species of excess, and by economical management and a due experience of his stone material, he would find himself able to recur nearly to the proportions of the earlier wooden edifice, which he always remembered as his model, and of which the natural forms must have been far more congenial to his modes of thinking and feeling than those of its first transcript in marble. The Indian excavator was totally regardless of true architectural unity and expression: finding his shafts more massive than needful, but from the nature of his work, being without motive to reduce them to the limits of necessity, he spoilt their naturally fine expression by reducing their power without proportionably diminishing their general bulk, carving them into merely arbitrary, or, perhaps, symbolical forms. He was not, in the high sense of the word, an architect at all; and we have no further business with him, or with any of his class, of Mexico, Persepolis, China, or elsewhere, now that we have mentioned him and them as examples of what true architects are not.

The Egyptian builder had open to him two ways of increasing his favourite architectural expression of material power and duration; of which the first and most obvious would be to increase the actual masses of his work, even beyond their original excess.\* When we look on the vast bulks of architrave and cornice, and on the low-roofed spaces beneath, crammed with stunted columns, set, like squares of infantry, almost as thick as they can stand, we cannot doubt that this source of effect, in the simple reality, was abundantly employed. But a much more effective and properly artistical method of attaining the desired object was discovered by adding, to mere mass, architecturally expres-



sive forms. The form of the pyramid, reiterated and enforced with extraordinary labour and ingenuity, conferred an ostentation of permanence wherever it occurred; and the sentiment of power was vastly increased by the addition to gross bulk, of outlines indicative of weight,—suffered, or violently resisted.

And first, of the pyramidal form, which was everywhere repeated, and which, in its boast of stability, seemed to defy the earthquake itself. The simple pyramid, though this assertion may sound paradoxical, affords but a weak expression of pyramidal form, when compared with that which is as much the leading feature of Egyptian architecture, as the pedimented porch is of Greek, or the spire of Northern Gothic,—namely, the vast double-towered Propylon. It has been shown by a contemporary Review, in an essay to which Mr. Ruskin himself directs attention, that, in this feature, the pyramidal form is emphasised by various and co-operating devices of multiplication and contrast. We may follow the design of this edifice from its first formal type, in the pure pyramid, by steps, each one of which is a means of rendering the pyramidal outline more impressive to the imagination. The pyramid is first truncated; then, and without destroying the integrity of its effect, it is divided into two secondary pyramidal masses, by an opening over the central doorway: the posts and lintels of this doorway rise from the inclined face of the wall, until they reach, or *nearly reach*, a perpendicular position, the sides of the aperture being parallel, and not convergent, as in the Greek entrances. On either side of this central doorway, which, by its upper projection and parallelism, throws the sloping walls into most effective contrast, there are commonly cavities like blank doorways, or merely long channels, incised perpendicularly in the pyramidal mass. These channels appear to have received perpendicular flag-staves, which rose above the top of the edifice, and acted, together with the cavities, in which their lower ends were hidden, as additional gauges of, and foils to, the slant of the wall. A cornice of the Propylon, always consisting of the hollow and impending moulding, called the ‘cavetto,’ crowns the pyramidal towers, and strikingly increases their general expression by a partial and comparatively insignificant violation of it. The angles of the building, where of course the pyramidal form is chiefly apparent to the eye, are strongly marked by a great roll moulding. Such are the main elements of an architectural effect, which is at the same time so simple and so powerful that a child, if he has once beheld it in one of Roberts’s sketches, or, less perfectly, in the Hall in Piccadilly, can never forget it, though he might all his life be unable to account for it. The

same or similar means were adopted for directing the eye to the pyramidal form in the other parts of the Egyptian temple. The outer walls, — and it is worthy of remark that this must have been at a great expense of constructional convenience, — were sometimes inclined for pyramidal effect; they also received the peculiar impending cornice, and revealed, between their sloping sides, the vertical colonnade. A further contrast was brought out between the masonry, always and ostentatiously of a stupendous thickness, and the abundance of sculpture in extremely shallow relief; while, finally, in the most conspicuous place, and as the liveliest foil to the low-spreading and eternal bulk of the Temple-palace, rose the airy obelisk.

The presence of weight, besides suggesting itself significantly in the prevalence of shelving masonry, was unmistakably announced in the forms of columns, as well as in their superabundance. Where the Greek, who wished to express a widely different notion, carved his shaft into hollow channels or flutes, the Egyptian frequently carved upon his a somewhat similar decoration, but *convex*. The shafts, near the base, often exhibited a bulge, strongly indicative of sufferance from pressure; and the capitals, by a very ingenious formation, were made to denote violent resistance to superincumbent weight. Mr. Gwilt says, 'The use of the palm leaf in this situation (*i. e.* in the capitals of the columns) may have been derived from a popular notion mentioned by Plutarch (*Symposiac. lib. vi. cap. 4.*), that the palm tree rose under any weight that was placed upon it, and even in proportion to the degree of pressure it experienced. This supposed peculiarity is also mentioned by Aulus Gellius (*lib. iii. cap. 6.*).' The same kind of unconscious testimony in favour of the views we are taking, is borne in another place by Mr. Gwilt, who, not entering into the spirit of their architecture, complains that 'Solidity is abused in the works of the Egyptians;' and that 'the means employed seem always greater than the ends.'

Three times our space would scarcely suffice for explaining the means employed in securing the remarkable character of Egyptian architecture; but in this, and throughout our examination of the series of great architectural styles, we must be contented with distinctly pointing out the principle on which their several details must be observed and judged.

We come now to the Greek architecture, in defence of which we have engaged to break a lance with the author of the 'Stones of Venice.' Mr. Ruskin tells us that the two virtues of architecture which we can justly weigh are, its 'strength, or good construction, and its beauty, or good decoration.' He

allows that there is a third virtue, which he calls 'expressional character;' but he seems to mean by this phrase much less than we think ought to be meant by it. 'It is not,' he says, 'possible to make expressional character any fair criterion of excellence in buildings. It is evident that we can establish no general laws concerning it. First, because it is not a virtue required in all buildings. . . . Secondly, because there are countless methods of expression, some conventional, some natural. . . . The choice of conventional methods depends on circumstances out of calculation, and that of natural methods on sensations out of control.' Mr. Ruskin 'leaves, therefore, the expression of buildings for incidental notice only,' and in doing this, if we mistake not, he does what almost amounts to leaving Hamlet out of the play. He gives us no room to hope that the details, which we understand as being means of architectural expression, will have justice done to them in his second volume, under the head of 'Decoration,' or 'Ornament.' It was, of course, impossible not to recognise the existence of many of these details, though we are surprised to find that most of them are passed over in silence. Of those that are recognised, the greater number are thrown into one or other of the two categories of construction and ornament, which are assumed to include all possible architectural elements. Now every one knows what the word 'construction' means, and there is no mistaking what Mr. Ruskin means by the word 'ornament.' He divides ornament into 'noble' and 'ignoble.' Ignoble ornament is imitative of man's work, as 'I. Instruments of art, agriculture and war, armour, and dress: II. Drapery: III. Shipping: IV. Architecture itself.' Noble ornament is 'imitation of God's work,' of which the examples given as fitted for architectural adoption are too numerous for us to quote. If, then, Mr. Ruskin adheres faithfully to these first principles—and throughout the first volume of 'The Stones of Venice,' he has done so,—it is pretty clear what ought to be his opinion of styles like the Egyptian and the Greek, in which construction is often, and decoration always, subordinated to an expression—the basis of their unity—of which he takes no cognisance. Let the reader recall for a moment the Egyptian style, and its main features, which we have just enumerated and described. They certainly make a very poor figure as examples of either of Mr. Ruskin's 'virtues of architecture.' Most of them are caricatures and exaggerations of mere 'good construction;' and some of them, as the sloping walls and impending cornices, are absolute contradictions of it: nor are any of these features very striking examples of 'man's delight

'in God's work.' Nor do they answer at all to Mr. Ruskin's views of 'expressional character;' for they are 'thoroughly amenable to a general law, and are not at all dependent on 'circumstances out of calculation,' or on 'sensations out of control.' Egyptian architecture is, therefore, put aside with a passing compliment, which, however, it can scarcely deserve, on Mr. Ruskin's principles. The Greek style is treated with more respect; though its 'decorative' system comes in for several brief, but vigorous attacks. Upon examination, it seems to us that all Mr. Ruskin's charges amount to this: the details of Greek architecture are not what they do not at all pretend to be. In matter of construction, certain minor features, as the fluting of the shaft, are condemned for being constructively bad, this being, as with the slope of the Egyptian wall, precisely a part of their merit, as vehicles of contrastive expression. And, as regards 'decoration' in Mr. Ruskin's sense of the term, there is no such thing in good Greek architecture, if we except the sculpture of the frieze and pediment, which should always be regarded apart from the architecture;—for we quite agree in Mr. Ruskin's doctrine, that 'No perfect piece either of painting or sculpture, is an architectural ornament at all, except in that, 'vague sense in which any thing beautiful may be said to ornament the place it is in.' The Corinthian order, in which 'decoration,' as Mr. Ruskin understands it, makes its first appearance, is not properly a Greek order at all. In the famous 'Choragic monument of Lysicrates,' we certainly find the germ which was afterwards developed by the Greeks, working under Roman masters, into the order of temple architecture, called the 'Corinthian;' but it is noteworthy that this germ took life amidst unmistakable signs of architectural degeneration, the edifice in question, for example, being a secular monument, consisting of a mock temple, mounted on a high pedestal, and itself officiating as a pedestal for the prize tripod.

Every detail of pure Greek architecture is actively engaged in announcing the facts of the upbearing power, and the burden which is upborne, and in expressing a just balance of the two forces. The antithetical comparison which is often made, between the 'verticality' of the Pointed, and the 'horizontalty' of the Greek style, is quite without foundation. If this relationship exists any where, it is between the Pointed and the Egyptian architectures. In the Doric, and in a less degree in the Ionic style, the aspiring Gothic and the low and heavy Egyptian expressions are perfectly combined; the first expression breathing from every curve and cut of shaft and capital,—the latter showing itself, with surprising variety and power, in all the

features of the entablature, in the dead unbroken mass of the architrave, in the frieze, with its hanging row of triglyphs and guttæ, in the impending corona of the cornice, and, finally, in the low, pyramidal pediment. We have no room to enter upon the very interesting and artistical manner in which these active and balanced expressions of columns and entablature, and the contrasting passive expression of the walls, antæ, and wall-cornices are wrought out. But we cannot pass over, without remarking their perfect adaptation to the right architectural effect, such details as seem more especially to come under Mr. Ruskin's charges of being nothing more nor less than simply bad construction, or bad decoration. However, since these charges are made without any systematic attack upon Greek architecture, and occur chiefly as occasional foils to the asserted perfection of Italian Gothic, they cannot be dealt with systematically: we must take one or two of them at random, as they come.

'Beyond a certain point, and that a very low one, man cannot advance in the invention of beauty without directly imitating natural form: thus, in the Doric temple, the triglyph and cornice are unimitative, or imitative only of artificial cuttings of wood. No one would call these members beautiful; their influence over us is in their severity and simplicity. The fluting of the column, which I doubt not was the Greek symbol for the bark of a tree, was imitative in its origin, and feebly resembled many canaliculated organic structures. Beauty is instantly felt in it; but of a low order. The decoration proper was sought in the forms of organic life, and those chiefly human. Again, the Doric capital was unimitative; but all the beauty it had was dependent on the precision of its ovolo, a natural curve of the most frequent occurrence. The Ionic capital, (to my mind, as an architectural invention, exceedingly base,) nevertheless depended for all the beauty it had, on its adoption of a spiral line, perhaps the commonest of all that characterise the inferior orders of animal organism and habitation. Further progress could not be made without a direct imitation of the acanthus leaf.' (Seven Lamps, p. 96.)

Concerning the ornament commonly known as the Greek Fret or Guilloché, and the Egg and Dart moulding, Mr. Ruskin writes, in the same work, p. 97., as follows:—

'It so happens, that in the crystals of bismuth, formed by the unagitated cooling of the melted metal, there occurs a natural resemblance of it (the Fret) almost perfect. But crystals of bismuth not only are of unusual occurrence in every day life, but their form is, as far as I know, unique among metals; and not only unique, but only attainable by an artificial process, the metal itself never being found pure. I do not remember any other substance or arrangement which presents a resemblance to this Greek ornament. . . . on this ground, then, I allege the ornament to be ugly; or in the literal sense of the

word, monstrous; differing from anything that it is in the nature of man to admire: and I think an uncarved fillet or plinth, infinitely preferable to one covered with this vile concatenation of straight lines. . . . Often in association with this horrible design, we find, in Greek works, one which is as beautiful as this is painful—that Egg and Dart moulding, whose perfection in its place and way has never been surpassed. And why is this? Simply because the form of which it is chiefly composed is one, not only familiar to us in the soft-housing of the bird's nest, but happens to be that of nearly every pebble that rolls and murmurs under the surf of the sea in all its endless shore.'

In 'The Stones of Venice,' p. 305, we find the following notices of this same Egg and Dart, and of the Honeysuckle ornament; from which it appears that a couple of years' further consideration of the subject has only ended in a more intense expression of Mr. Ruskin's ill opinion of Greek ornament.

'The Greek Egg and Arrow cornice, is a nonsense cornice; very noble in its lines, but utterly absurd in meaning. Arrows have had nothing to do with eggs (at least since Leda's time), neither are the so-called arrows like arrows, nor the eggs like eggs, nor the honeysuckles like honeysuckles; they are all conventionalised into a monotonous successiveness of nothing,—pleasant to the eye, useless to the thought.'

We might quote more to the same purpose; but these passages are sufficient as samples of the rest. It will at once be observed that Mr. Ruskin criticises the details of Greek architecture, as if they were not architecture; as if they might be plucked from the building, like flowers from the stalk, without any loss of significance. Now we will go the full length with Mr. Ruskin in denying merit to these details considered as detached, or detachable decorations; but the fact is, that properly speaking, they are not decorations at all. The influence of triglyphs does not depend primarily on their severity and simplicity, but on their power, in juxtaposition with the guttæ beneath them, of greatly strengthening the idea of weight in the entablature, by the addition of their pendent effect to the effect of simple mass in the bare architrave below them, and of *impension* in the cornice above them. Conceal the lines of triglyphs and guttæ, in the print of a Doric temple, with your paper knife, and the building will look light-headed at once: that is to say, the actively expressed power of support in the shafts will appear to be in painful disproportion to the burden carried by them. Again, we believe that the bark of a tree, or any other 'caniculated organic structure,' is the last thing that any one, with no particular theory at heart, would ever think

of, in looking at a fluted shaft. This symbolism may have given birth to the flutes; but the beauty which continued their use and made it invariable, and which, as Mr. Ruskin allows, is instantly felt in it, has many accounts better than this to render of itself. The business of the shaft is to support weight; the aim of the Greek architect was to make it express, as well as perform, that business. The mind instinctively attributes motive and ascendant energy to a series of vertically convergent lines, which are checked before reaching their focus. This effect is much increased in the Doric shaft by the gentle swell, or entasis which accompanies its swift taper; but another, and far more subtle, and at the same time powerful reason, for the fluting is in the capacity of the series of concave surfaces to express an active resistance against, or rather a denial of, any tendency to burst and crumble beneath the super-imposed burden. This may, perhaps, seem a refinement; but let the reader compare the fluted Greek with the smooth 'Roman Doric' shaft, and he will probably acknowledge that a certain unpleasant effect which always accompanies the last, and which caused the Greeks invariably to flute their shafts, is mainly owing to the absence of any such suggestion of resisting power. That which sounds like an over-refinement when explained to the understanding, is often simple enough to the eye.

The fine hyperbolic curve, which is sometimes found in the Doric capitals, and upon which Mr. Ruskin affirms that all its beauty depends, no doubt constitutes one, but one of the least essential, of the elements of effect in that member. The capital, the point of conflict, as it were, between the opposed powers of weight and support, is the most interesting, and most carefully elaborated feature of Greek architecture. The curve in question was evidently not looked upon as very essential, for it was sometimes left out altogether, and replaced by a straight line; but the 'quirk,' or sudden contraction of the expanding surface, whether curved or straight, just before it reaches the 'abacus,' and the single or triple channel, which cuts through the fluting into the substance of the shaft; a little before its termination, were never omitted. Neither of these invariable features of Greek Doric will bear to be called decoration,—even bad decoration,—in Mr. Ruskin's sense of the word. According to his system, however, they fall well enough under the head of 'bad construction;' for each of them is a positive diminution of the actual power of support just in the position where that power is most demanded. We hope that Mr. Ruskin, in his forthcoming volume, will consent to do justice to these, and to several Doric and Ionic details, which most admirably express sufficient abi-

lity for the performance of their work, by making a slight, but obvious sacrifice of force, in precisely the most critical positions.\*

The 'Egg and Dart,' the 'Fret,' and certain other forms that were carved or painted on Greek mouldings and fillets, seem, at first sight, to be open to criticism as decoration; understanding, for the present, by the term, what Mr. Ruskin always requires us to understand by it,—imitation of natural or artificial objects for the sake of an intrinsic beauty supposed to be perceived in them. We fancy, however, that these details are fully defensible on the foregoing grounds. The Greek mouldings are very few and very simple, and have in their forms a reference to weight, so distinct, that it is universally recognised in practice; and we have heard it acknowledged in terms, not only by architects, but by ordinary plaster cornice manufacturers. This reference to weight, suffered and resisted, is the justification of their use in Greek architecture. F. Kugler has remarked (we believe for the first time), that each moulding has its allotted figure carved or painted upon it, and that this figure is the one which, of all others, is the *best fitted to exhibit the peculiar form of the moulding*. Thus the 'Egg and Dart' is so constantly appropriated to the most important of the Greek mouldings as to have conferred upon it the name of 'ovolo;' and its utility is such that it would be quite impossible, at a certain distance, and in unfavourable lights, to distinguish the ovolo from the 'cyma,' with which it is frequently associated, were it not for their explanatory carving or colouring. No one who is well acquainted with the peculiar figure can believe that its resemblance to any natural form is anything more than an accident: indeed the great body of critics who agree in Mr. Ruskin's mode of viewing this so-called 'ornament,' do not seem to have made up their minds as to what it is like; some call it 'egg and dart;' others, 'egg and anchor;' others, 'egg and tongue;' others even deny it the slight decorative merit of being like an egg, affirming that when seen with its original paint, context, and at a proper distance, it has rather the appearance of an overlapping leaf.

---

\* We were lately discussing the end and operation of these and other details, with a sceptical architect, who facetiously suggested that a porter ought to stand upon one leg if he wished to produce an architectural effect under his burden. We answered, and we fancy, partly converted our opponent, by referring him to the Caryatides of the Pandrosium, figures which actually do receive the whole burden of the entablature on one leg, the knee of the other being bent forward.



The 'vile concatenation of straight lines,' well known to most of our readers as the 'Fret,' is the figure which was most frequently painted on long, flat, and narrow bands, intended to act merely as bounding or separating members. This figure and, in a less degree, others which were less frequently employed, served, on the fillet or band, exactly the same purpose as the egg and dart on the ovolo, namely, to pronounce and to intensify its natural effect by lines which multiplied its outline, and attracted the eye to it.

Thus, then, we fully admit, with Mr. Ruskin, that the Greek architects were remarkably careless of faithful imitation of natural objects. Nay, we will go further, and assert our belief that they studiously avoided any such imitation; that, if they carved or painted figures something like eggs, honeysuckles, or arrow-heads, it was not their fault. They would much rather, we believe, have made the figures upon the mouldings, bands, and fillets purely abstract, and unlike any natural objects in the world, had that been possible; because any degree of likeness to such objects tended to divert the attention of the spectator from the abstract and all-important forms of the architectural members upon which those figures were cut or painted.

The Greek system of architectural colouring is vehemently denounced by Mr. Ruskin, and upon principles which we should vainly endeavour to answer, if we assumed, with him, that colour was employed by the architects for its own sake, and not, like other so-called 'decorations,' merely for the purpose of bringing out and adding to the purely formal expression of the members on which it was used. Most writers have looked shy upon this subject of architectural colouring. It seems at first to be a violent disturbance of certain traditional notions of 'simplicity,' 'purity,' 'classicality,' (!) and other vaguely defined qualities, which have always been attributed to Greek art; but one or two plain considerations will be enough to justify our persevering faith in the almost infallible good taste of the Greeks. Architectural painting, with us, has come to be regarded as an expedient for making brick, or some other cheap material, look like stone; this cause of unarchitectural character did not exist with the Greeks, upon whom the effect of a stone material could no more have been disturbed by simple colouring than that of metal material is disturbed by it with us. Coatings of paint, laid on very thickly, and sometimes upon a substratum of plaster, served the important end of hiding the joints of the masonry, where they would have interfered with the desired effect, as in the fluted shafts, of which the ascendant vigour would have suffered a serious check from the horizontal junc-

tions of the frustra. Again, the unequal weather-staining of stone, though pleasing in itself, would have rendered less obvious the far more significant quality of expressive architectural form, especially in the lesser details of mouldings, triglyphs, &c. Over and above these valuable negative services of painting, there seems to have been an important positive end obtained, by an arrangement of the colours with reference to the different architectural expressions of the details. A brilliant blue and a dense red appear to have been the predominant colours; and the reader will at once perceive what assistance must have been afforded to the expression which we have traced in several details, by a judicious contrast of these colours. The aspiring shaft, with a bright blue fluting, separated, probably, by red fillets, bore up, first, the plain architrave of heavy red; above the architrave hung a row of triglyphs and guttæ, of the same colour; the channels of the triglyphs, the spaces of frieze between them, and the bands and plates, from which the upper and lower guttæ hung, seem to have been blue. The same principle, as far as we are enabled to judge from the indistinct remains of ancient colouring, prevailed throughout all the details. Where, however, the colouring had no direct reference to the effects of weight and lightness, but was used only to give distinctness to forms which had this reference, other colours appear to have been used. There can be little doubt, but that this curious and hitherto ill-understood subject would have great, if not full light cast upon it, by a careful study of what is known concerning it with reference to this idea. In the meantime, we have said enough to account for the direct violation, under the Greek system, of all Mr. Ruskin's rules of architectural colouring:—‘Let it be visibly independent of form. ‘Never paint a column with vertical lines, but always cross it. ‘Never give separate mouldings separate colours; and in ‘sculptured ornaments do not paint the leaves and figures (I ‘cannot help the Elgin frieze) of one colour, and their ground ‘of another.’

Had we space, we would gladly undertake to justify, upon the foregoing grounds, every detail of pure Greek architecture, —even the ‘exceedingly base’ Ionic capital. As it is, we must close our notice of this style by remarking, that, even in the somewhat florid Ionic of the Erectheion, and the pure Greek approximations to the Corinthian ‘order,’ we have nothing that professes to be independent ‘decoration.’ Below the volutes of the Erectheion, a necking of simple foliage, in unobtrusive relief, beautifully expresses to the imagination the sufficient power of the shaft where its diameter is smallest.

The capitals of the 'Monument of Lysicrates,' and of the 'Tower of the Winds,' and even those of early and good Roman Corinthian, are examples more or less licentious of the operation of the same idea; and it was not until the Attic spirit was wholly quenched, that 'decoration' proper made its appearance, claiming the chief consideration for itself, instead of working as a servant for the honour and profit of a master.

When the best period of an art is over, and a degenerated and imitative one succeeds, it is to be expected that the latter should exhibit a non-comprehension of some, and an extravagant use of other of the means employed to affect the imagination in the former and purer time. This was the case with Roman architecture. We may discover in it a lively appreciation of the expressional effect of some few Greek details, and a tolerable comprehension of the source of that effect; but the Roman architects had no knowledge or feeling of the severity with which the various elements of the Greek art were subordinated to the perfect utterance, by the whole, of the language which was spoken, more or less plainly, by every part. Isolated details, therefore, acquired an independent importance; the colonnade, which in Greek architecture had no significance without reference to the supported entablature, was raised, as it were, for admiration, on a series of pedestals; single shafts rose beneath nothing in the places of public concourse; and attempts, entirely and necessarily abortive, were made to reconcile and harmonise certain of the Greek details with the new and contradictory element of the semicircular arch. Circular form was diligently sought for. The Doric shaft became a plain cylinder; the outlines of mouldings, in Greek architecture conic sections, became segments of circles; the dome rose behind the pediment, the horizontal entablature was at last wholly relinquished, and the arch sprang from column to column, bearing with it the entablature *curved*; and in this condition of impotence and inconsistency the architecture of Pagan Rome was transplanted to Byzantium.

The early Byzantines made a bold and unmistakable effort to create a style of architecture, in which the semicircular arch should afford, not only the main principle of construction, but also the theme of the expression. In Mr. Hope's words, 'Arches rising over arches, and cupolas over cupolas, we may say, that all which in the temples of Athens had been straight, angular, and square, in the churches of Constantinople became curved and rounded, concave within, and convex without.' In this attempt to obtain expression from the arch, there was necessarily involved a change that seriously

impaired the beauty of every building in which it was made. The object of the circular arch is the distributed weight of the wall; just as the object of the column is the *entablature*, or the wall concentrated upon its capital, by means of the arch. The Byzantines, however, made the arch the chief object to the eye, setting little importance upon the chief object of the arch; and the consequence is, that an unpleasant sense of imperfect purpose is experienced by the beholder of most of the edifices in this style. A great resisting power, and one which immediately declares itself as such to the eye, is constantly and ostentatiously displayed, and little is given it to do. The natural upshot of this system was, that the power, wanting its proper object, took to displaying itself in fantastical tricks, of which, perhaps, the most famous and most foolish is the dome of St. Sophia at Constantinople. The chief boast of this dome — that it looks as if kept from falling down by a *miracle*, appearing thereby to justify its fabled origin, — is, as Mr. Ruskin says, its chief artistical defect; this defect is purchased at an immense expense of constructional convenience; and, after all, the wonder is but a lying wonder; for that which the uninitiated spectator gapes at, as a vast mass of legitimate masonry, unaccountably suspended in air, is a structure of Rhodian bricks and pumice-stone, possessing only a small proportion of the supposed force of gravitation; and exerting a lateral thrust, which is met by a vast and hidden buttress-system. This species of falsehood attained its climax in the dome of St. Vitale, Ravenna, which, while it claims credit for being constructed of stones, put together upon the principle of the all-prevalent arch, is, in reality, a kind of grotto, formed by a coil of empty earthen jars. In the Romano-Byzantine, or Lombard style, the semicircular arch was set to do its right work, and, for the first time, it then acquired its true expression, which was wholly subordinated to that of the wall: but, before entering upon this part of our subject, we must drop our chronology, and follow the Byzantine fancy into its full development by the Arab architects.

The aimlessness of the arch, which in the Byzantine style was an occasional blunder, became a distinct and carefully fulfilled intention with the Moresque architects, who, obeying what seems to be a constant condition of good architectural expression, namely, that it shall have some allusion to the law of gravitation, hit upon a species of allusion to that law, which was as agreeable to the vivid and excitable Arabian temperament as it would have been painful to the associations of the Egyptian, and ridiculous to the good sense of the Greek. The

miracle of the dome of St. Sophia became the common nature of the Moresque roofs. Gravitation, consolidated by the Egyptian, adequately opposed by the Greek, and turned into aspiration by the Gothic architect, was by the Arabian boldly and simply negated. The form of the arch is repeated in his buildings without end; but it seldom has, or, rather, it seldom appears to have, any work to do: And this ostentatious idleness in a powerful means of support, together with a most curious and elaborate system of real or apparent lateral thrusts, by which the idea of gravitation in all the masses is hidden or confused to the eye, is the grand source of the marvellous effects of the Alhambra, and of the Mosque of Cordova,—to which, as being the edifices of this style which are most generally known, we refer our readers for examples of the details to which we shall have to allude.

We cannot, without illustrations, explain to the general reader many of the most striking methods by which the Arabian architect managed to contradict the idea of weight in his masses, and to make them appear to hang above our heads like summer clouds. We shall therefore notice only a few and well-known leading features. The Byzantine dome, 'upon pendentives,' as we have seen, exerts no perpendicular pressure, and requires no perpendicular support. All its weight is met by lateral and unseen, or, at least, unexpressed resisting forces; nevertheless, the vastness and simplicity of its form is such, that the beholder is led at once to infer the existence of such forces. In the honey-comb roofs of the Alhambra the eye is diverted from the direction of the weight by the innumerable repetitions of the pendent form into which the roof is broken up, and which really do hang above us in the air; as, the main dome pretends to do, being enabled principally by their means to practise its deception. Arches over very wide apertures frequently deny their true character by precisely the same expedient; they are broken up into little useless arches, or foliations, which entirely destroy the natural expression of the main arch, and win us, in some sort, to believe that it is as free from burden as themselves. Among the very curious means of confusing the eye as to the work done, or capable of being done, by the wide arch, the under surface, as we find on coming beneath it, is hollowed out into a deep and broad channel, leaving no substantial arch at all; the true working arch being higher up, and altogether unexpressed. In other cases, a similar effect is produced by decorating the wall immediately over the aperture with two arches, one above the other, but having the same width, and springing from the same points.

In this case one at least of the arches is necessarily and obviously useless, and the eye does not readily credit either of them for doing the work. The broader the arch, and the heavier the burden that it bears, the more numerous and elaborate are the boasts of its form and the denials of its office. When the arch is not very wide its outline is left pure; but in this case new and equally curious expedients are adopted to conceal from the eye the performance of its mechanical purpose. The surface of the wall, above colonnades bearing arcades, is almost invariably divided by broad perpendicular beams, which rest on the capitals of the columns, and by horizontal beams laid on the tops of those which are upright. In this case only a small rectangular division of the wall remains to be borne by the arch, and the weight even of this, to appearance, is thrown off, upon the upright beams, by a network of transverse bars. The upright beam, in its turn, takes upon itself to deny its duty, or, at least, to confuse to the eye the inevitable exhibition of it, as far as possible, by assuming, with the help of the arch abutting on each side, the form of a huge pendent, the end of which is carved with the characteristic honey-comb figure, and meets a shaft and capital of dimensions so slight, that they seem to depend from rather than to support the masses above them. The arches between the columns never rest upon the capitals, but almost invariably maintain their position, and deceive the eye as to the direction of their forces, by abutting upon the sides of the upright posts. This is, perhaps, the most universally characteristic, and, at the same time, the most powerfully effective rule of Arab architecture; and the exception to it is even more striking, in its adaptation to the spirit of the style, than the rule itself. When the arch rests directly on the column, its terminations, instead of turning outwards, as they usually do, to meet the upright beams, are turned inwards, forming the characteristic 'horse-shoe' arch, and throwing the line of the arch, along which the eye travels, considerably beyond the capital, into vacuity, the actual working arch ceasing considerably within the ostensible terminations, and abutting directly, but unexpressed, upon the capital. Wherever a single archway pierces a plain wall, it is framed in a broad rectangular mass of fretwork, which, not alone by the transverse direction of its lines, as explained above, but also by the simple occurrence of so large a surface of light ornament added in that peculiar position, diverts the eye from the direction, and almost from the fact of the existence of the forces, which the arch in reality resists. It is noteworthy, that this peculiar fretwork of transverse lines seldom occurs, except where it has to practise

this deception upon the eye, but that *there* it is almost invariably present. In the labyrinthine aisles of the Mosque of Cordova, the most remarkable of many expedients for obtaining the desired negation of supported mass, is an endless multiplication of totally useless arches, springing, like trelliswork, from post to post, in the closest and most curiously deceptive association with those which actually support and constitute the vaulted roof. In this building, which is one of the earliest specimens of true Moresque architecture, and in the Alhambra, which is about the latest, one and the same artistical purpose prevails; and the few instances which have now been given of its operation are enough, we conceive, to enable the student to trace it as the main secret of expression every where throughout the details of this remarkable and, as yet, not sufficiently appreciated style,—a style to which Mr. Ruskin does not attribute too much importance, when he says, ‘The lava stream of the Arab, even after it had ceased to flow, warmed the whole of the northern air; and the history of Gothic architecture is the history of the refinement and spiritualisation of northern work under its influence.’ (*Stones of Venice*, p. 19.)

We have now to speak of the Romano-Byzantine, or, as it is commonly called, the Lombard style, our ‘Norman’ being one of its varieties. Mr. Hope remarks that, ‘In Lombard buildings, the whole of the strength requisite for support and resistance is sought in the general thickness of the wall.’ This power of the wall constitutes the theme of the Lombard system of expression. The most common and peculiar decoration of the Lombard style is a sort of recessed panelling, produced, as it seems to the eye, by removing a certain thickness of the wall, and leaving a band of the original thickness, which follows the outlines of the walls, and surrounds the recessed spaces. This recessed space is seldom allowed to be large enough to admit of the eyes resting upon it to the exclusion of the raised surfaces. If the front or flank of the building is too large to be thoroughly taken in at once, its surface is divided up by strips of wall, dropped from the upper projecting surfaces, or ‘wall plates;’ or sometimes sent across from the perpendicular strips at the angles. These bands are of little—often of no use to the wall: the true buttress form is carefully avoided in them; but they powerfully aid the Lombard expression, by beginning, as the like Greek architecture began, with a delicate, but decided assertion of a superabundance of the kind of power to be displayed. The office of these ‘wall plates’ is greatly assisted by their reception of a degree of enrichment greater than that which is conferred upon the principal recessed surfaces. This enrichment, which consists in its

most frequent and most efficient form, of a series of simple arch-heads or 'scollops,' impresses on the eye the existence and character of the raised wall-plate, and is therefore 'décoration' precisely in the same sense as the Greek fret or egg-and-dart is decoration. These recessions of the general surface of the wall are seldom limited to one degree: the recessed face recedes again behind a series of shallow arcades; and yet again, arcade within arcade; and in the upper parts of edifices, there are often actual galleries practised in the enormous thickness of the wall. Apertures are turned to account with great skill; the chamfer or bevel of those which are to give light — contrary to the method which would be dictated by mere utility — is often chiefly external, and its depth is commonly marked, and even exaggerated, to the eye, by a perspective of elaborately carved mouldings, one behind the other. Lombard doorways of large dimensions are often approached by an advanced porch; and we do not perceive, on entering, where the porch ends and the wall begins: thus the eye is saved from the disappointment it might suffer, upon perceiving that the wall-decoration had indicated an amount of thickness which the wall, however solid, must have failed to realise. The devices employed, on this feature, for augmenting the importance of the wall, are various and highly interesting; but they are too numerous, and require too much technical explanation to be described here. There is one, however, of the most common and effective of these methods which we must not pass over. When there is no porch, a great part of the thickness of the wall is traversed and forced into notice by the shafted and moulded arch; but, before the wall is pierced, this chamfered approach stops, and is made to include a portion of plain wall, with an aperture, of which the head is horizontal, and the jambs plain, and at right angles to the face of the wall. Thus, there is a series of deep recessions from the outer wall surface, which, when they terminate, leave a further thickness to be traversed by the true aperture, the rectangular cutting of which leaves the remaining thickness, when the spectator is not absolutely within the doorway, to be measured by his imagination.

The outlines of apertures are most appropriate. Doorways and arcades always adopt the semicircular arch; and the most characteristic form of the Lombard window is the perfect circle, exhibiting the principle of the arch, of which, as we have said, the proper object is the wall, in its fullest development. The rosette window is the invention and most striking feature of Lombard architecture; and it is impossible to imagine a more admirable means of giving effect and artistic importance to the wall than the presence, in every principal façade, of the great



circular window, revealing by its deep and decorated chamfer the vast power to which, by its form, it expresses an infinite power of resistance. The filling up of this window, when it is large, by thick bars, radiating from an inner circle, like the spokes of a wheel, excellently and obviously subserve this expression.

We must here take occasion to remind the reader that the views which we are advocating concerning the *expressional* intention or effect of this and other architectural details, in no way interferes with the symbolical intentions which have been often attributed to them, and of the existence of which, in many cases, as in this of the Rose or 'Catherine-wheel' windows, there can be no doubt. We hold, however, that, in an architectural work, next in importance to constructive obligations stands architectural expression, and that it would be out of course to attribute the existence of a feature, which perfectly fulfils the conditions of right construction and appropriate expression, to its capacity of receiving a further symbolical value.

Ornament, in Lombard edifices, is beautifully subordinated to the effect of pure masses of wall. It clusters about windows, cornices, string-courses and door-ways, and breaks out occasionally upon the wall itself; but it is always felt to be a judicious and brilliant foil, rather than an interruption to the plain and principal wall surfaces. This is the right economy of decoration; and we maintain, against Mr. Ruskin, that that which is all decoration is no decoration, for decoration should always, as in this case, subserve an object, and not be an object in itself. Lombard decoration was, moreover, fitted, no less by its peculiar character of amazing and apparently reckless variety, than by its skilful distribution, to give expression, by contrast, to the pure sheets of the all-important wall.

There are numerous features in Lombard architecture which aid the main expression, chiefly by negating the possibility of any other. The wall ostentatiously rejects all aid. Where a pilaster or a buttress might naturally be looked for, we find, instead, a thin strip of wall or a moulding, carved to look like a rope, dropped from the cornice to the ground, with an effect the very reverse of an external prop. Shafts are plentifully used, but with visual results far different from that of the Greek system, in which the shaft is an *essential* part of the construction and expression. The thickness of the Lombard shafts, especially in the Norman variety of the style, seldom bears the right proportion to their apparent duty: sometimes they are too thick; sometimes too thin; very frequently they are twisted, and contorted, and knotted together; super-imposed arcades are ar-

ranged without any attention to the rule dictated by common sense, that the bases of the upper series of columns should stand above the capitals of the lower; occasionally a shaft is made to look as though it were broken in the middle; the capitals generally bear the most ingenious irrelevance to the office of capitals as burden carriers; often, and in the principal porch almost invariably, the shafts are set upon the backs of beasts or reptiles; all of which practices betoken, in the column, an almost humorous sense of irresponsibility, and very materially assist in the self-assertion of the wall, whereon series after series of useless columns, forming useless arcades, or connecting upper with lower string-courses, appear as a constant superficial decoration—a decoration which Mr. Ruskin must of course condemn, in his forthcoming volume, as falling under the head of ‘imitation of architecture.’ When colonnades support the nave-walls,—as, chiefly in southern work, and before the invention of the pier, they often do,—they seem to have been regarded as unavoidable evils, and are left with as little architectural expression as possible. In the best and latest works they are replaced by piers, masses of wall declaring themselves to be such, and displaying their vast bulk to advantage, by juxtaposition with slender shafts, which nestle in their angles.

Although we entertain no small admiration of the subtlety and consistency with which the Lombard architects deduced a true architectural expression from the peculiar constructive necessity to which they were submitted, we cannot agree with Mr. Ruskin in his estimate of Lombard architecture, relatively to other styles. We feel little hesitation in declaring our opinion that this architecture, considered from the artistic point of view, is inferior in dignity to the Egyptian, Greek, and Northern Pointed styles. Its characteristic and all-prevalent expression possesses no such power of affecting the imagination, through association of ideas, as is possessed by these three styles, which, as we believe, have not yet found, and probably never will find, a fourth worthy of being ranked with them. Unity, it is true, even without reference to the worth of the unifying principle, is always delightful to the mind; and the perfect co-operation of many of the most various details towards the expression of a single thought or fact, constitutes in itself an eminent degree of merit. This is the merit, and we are disposed to believe that it is nearly all the merit, which can be rightly claimed for the expressional systems of the Lombard and Arabian architectures. The Lombard style is, moreover, chargeable with a practical deficiency, which exists, in an equal degree at least, in no other mode of architecture. It is only adapted to very large edifices, since

these alone admit of a thickness of wall sufficient to give effective scope to the peculiar details of the style. Hence the unsatisfactory effect of most modern attempts in the Lombard manner, as compared with others in the subsequent style—concerning which we are now to speak.

As the leading expression of the Northern Pointed architecture has been not only generally perceived, but also frequently defined; and as even the methods of expression, are many of them described in the works of the host of critics, professional and amateur, who have lately written upon the subject, we shall limit our remarks to certain novel, and, we must think, erroneous doctrines, put forth by Mr. Ruskin, upon this and other questions relating to the pointed style. From the following passage it will be seen that he dissents entirely from the views which are now prevalent concerning Northern Gothic, and that he speaks of it in almost the same terms which have made Wren and Evelyn famous for not having appreciated a kind of excellence which did not fall in with the popular tastes of their period:—

‘The desire to build high is complicated [in this style] with the peculiar love of the grotesque which is characteristic of the North, together with especial delight in the multiplication of small forms as well as exaggerated points of shade and energy, and a consequent degree of insensibility to perfect grace and quiet truthfulness; so that a northern architect could not feel the beauty of the Elgin marbles . . . whereas, among the Italian Gothic workmen, this capacity was never lost. . . . There can be no question that theirs was the greatest school, and carried out by the greatest men; and that while those who began with this school could perfectly well feel Roman Cathedral, those who study the Northern Gothic remain in a narrow field, one of small pinnacles and dots, and crockets, and twined faces—and cannot comprehend the meaning of a broad surface or a grand line. . . . The Gothic of the Ducal Palace at Venice is in harmony with all that is grand in the world; that of the north is in harmony with the grotesque northern spirit only.’

We need not discuss the relative merits of Cologne Cathedral and of the Venetian Palazzo Ducale, which Mr. Ruskin holds to be, for merit as well as historically, the ‘central building of the ‘world.’ Mr. Ruskin is not likely to make any considerable body of converts to his opinion, so long as he founds his judgment of Northern Gothic architecture upon an estimate from which the chief and all but universally recognised artistic principle of the style is omitted. To substitute a mere ‘desire to ‘build high,’ and an ‘especial delight in the multiplication of ‘small forms,’ for the sentiment of aspiration and for the invention and application of innumerable details, directed towards the

expression of that sentiment, is an injustice to our Northern style which is almost too manifest to require exposure; and if any one has been dazzled into the belief of it by Mr. Ruskin's persuasive eloquence, let him compare any series of engravings of Gothic cathedral spires with Ferguson's or Daniel's illustrations of Hindoo pagodas. The thorough applicability of Mr. Ruskin's charges to these last will be a sufficient demonstration of their untruth when applied to the first. In attempting to compare the mediæval secular architecture of Venice with the Northern temple architecture of the same date, Mr. Ruskin has perhaps allowed himself, in consequence of the accident of the two styles having a common name, to overlook the fact that they have no common fundamental principle. The decorative use of the pointed arch for apertures is almost 'all that the two styles have in common; and, consequently, they are not properly the subjects of comparison. This use of the pointed arch does not constitute the essential character of any style. The Arabian, the Lombard, the modern Indian, all made use of the pointed arch, without at all approximating to the principles of 'pointed architecture.'

Broad surfaces and grand lines are not beauties to be looked for in a style of which the peculiar constructive merit is, that it does away with the wall; and the sunny cheerfulness which Mr. Ruskin so much admires in Venetian house-architecture, ought not to be lamented as wanting in the Christian temple by one who has before, and most justly, said, 'There must be, in this 'magnificently human art of architecture, some equivalent expression for the trouble and wrath of life; for its sorrow and its mystery; — and this it can only give by depth or diffusion of gloom — by the frown upon its front, and the shadow of its recess.' As to the assertion of the incapacity of the northern workmen for the appreciation of the calm beauty and power of which Mr. Ruskin takes the Elgin marbles for types, there is many a Gothic figure wearing away almost unnoticed in the Northern frosts and rains, which, for simple grace and truth, though not perhaps for laborious finish, might dispute the palm with the friezes of the Parthenon.

Let us now notice two or three curious results, bearing upon Mr. Ruskin's Northern-Gothic criticisms, from his failure in perceiving any intention on the part of Northern architects to give effect, by 'decoration,' to that peculiar expression of ascendant vigour, which, as we have maintained, was probably the natural consequence of the constructive principle adopted by them; — whether or not, in the first instance, from the barbarous 'desire 'to build high,' we shall not stop to inquire.

The Gothic architect, after he had ~~once~~ perceived the kind of effect which it was desirable to substitute for the Lombard expression (the Lombard construction having been discarded) found, almost ready made to his hand, one of the most important of the numerous means of producing it; namely, the Lombard ornamental column, with its base and capital, which, in various ways, expressed a total independence of constructive origin. There was, however, this difference between the class of Lombard shafts which we have noticed above, and the Gothic shaft, that the first was constructively superfluous, and expressed as much; whereas the last had really to take a primary part, — to bear burdens, and yet appear to do nothing of the sort, the burden and bearing members being alike transformed into portions of the great vertical stream of piers, pointed arches, groined vaults and vaulting shafts. The simplest way of obtaining this effect was, to leave out base and capital altogether. It took some time, however, for architects who had always regarded a capital and a base as the natural extremities of a shaft, to get rid of the tradition; and when, at last, they seem to have done so, it was found that a base of some sort was essential to safe construction, and that there were serious artistical objections to dispensing altogether with the capital. When capitals were totally omitted, as sometimes was the case in splendid examples, as Cologne among others, — the eye became sensible of an unpleasant dubiousness as to the point from which the arch sprang; and when the moulded or many-shafted pier was the stem from which arose a system of still more numerous divergent ribs and mouldings, the capital was needed to cover the junction of the two systems, its omission necessitating the very disagreeable alternative of the 'discontinuous impost.' Elaborate devices were, therefore, invented for denying, and, as far as possible, reversing in their visual effects, the nature of bases and capitals as constructive members. Mr. Ruskin condemns a large class of Gothic capitals as 'unnecessary and ridiculous,' because they have 'no bearing power.' Now we hold that this expressed absence of any increase of power at the point of the capital is the only condition under which capitals could have been admitted into Gothic architecture; and that they are neither 'unnecessary' nor 'ridiculous,' because they perform what we have seen to be the important function of marking the termination of the shaft or pier, and the commencement of the arch. Another, and a very good reason for the existence of capitals in Gothic architecture, is one and the same with that which constitutes the merit of the horizontal channels under the Doric ovolo; namely, that they really add to the ascendant vigour of the members on

which they occur, by opposing to that vigour an obstacle to be conquered. Mr. Freeman, whose remarks on some of the means of producing the effect of aspiration in Gothic architecture are particularly valuable, rightly says, 'When there is no strife, there is no victory: the vertical line cannot be called predominant unless the horizontal exist in a visible condition of subjection and inferiority.' Again, Mr. Ruskin declares that the 'shaft-system and moulding-system are entirely separate;' and he loudly complains that, 'the Gothic architects confounded the two — they clustered the shafts till they looked like a group of mouldings — they shod and captailed the mouldings till they looked like a group of shafts.' Now this, which Mr. Ruskin admits to be the 'eminently characteristic state of Gothic,' seems to us to be a necessary completion of the Gothic idea. It is only in styles of the Greek type that the shaft and moulding systems are rightly separate; and there is better reason to complain of the frequent distinction of shaft from moulding than of their amalgamation, in an architecture from which the shaft, as an expressed supporting member, is banished. Mr. Ruskin tells us that 'he knows how much Gothic, otherwise beautiful, this sweeping principle condemns.' In our opinion, it condemns all Gothic or none.

The 'flying buttress,' according to Mr. Ruskin, 'is to be considered as a mere prop or shore;' and the merit of the form depends on its faithfully and visibly performing this somewhat humble office; and concerning 'crockets,' he remarks that 'they are subjected to no shadow of any other laws than those of grace and chastity.' We believe that we shall have the suffrages of most lovers of Northern Gothic on our side, when we affirm that the artistical merit of the form of the flying buttress consists in an expression precisely the reverse of the passive 'prop or shore;' and that its name gives the common and the true perception of its artistical merit, — which ought always to be carefully distinguished in Gothic more than in any other style of architecture, from constructive excellence. And again we look for an equal concurrence of opinion, when we assert that all good crockets are rigidly subject to the rule that they shall aid and heighten the general effect of aspiration, by representing the energy of vegetable or other life striving upwards, or overcoming an obstacle in its upward path. The eye instantly recognises a good crocket from a bad one by its performance or non-performance of this office. Compare the leaves growing in vigorous curves over the blocks which project at regular intervals, from the pinnacles of Cologne, with the grotesque monsters that try with all their might to save themselves from

slipping down the arched buttresses of Henry the Seventh's Chapel!

There seem to have been two principal causes of the imperfection of Mr. Ruskin's judgment on Northern Gothic. In the first place, he himself confesses that in certain respects his 'late studies in Italy have somewhat destroyed his sympathy with 'it.' And, secondly, he holds that 'the direct symbolisation of a sentiment is a weak motive with all men;' whence he deduces that the asserted effect of aspiration in Gothic architecture could not have been intended; and by a further consequence, that it can have no existence in it. We believe the argument to be vulnerable at every point. The direct symbolisation of sentiment is, if we mistake not, among the most powerful and universal of human instincts, producing a series of phenomena extending from the unconscious gesticulations of a child to the works of a Michel Angelo. But, granting as we do, that the symbolisation of religious activity, by aspiring forms, may possibly not have been intended, or even perceived by the Gothic architects, in the works which they designed, we have shown that a consistent and co-operating series of those forms might, and probably did, arise from the natural desire to intensify an expression which was, in the first instance, the simple result of a peculiar constructive system. At the same time nevertheless, the existence of a conscious intention, though we hold it to have been highly probable, was by no means necessary to the production of the effect in question, as Mr. Ruskin, and any one of far less spontaneous genius than he possesses, must very well understand, upon a minute's reflection on the operation of his own mind. For us, we confess, in these matters, 'seeing is believing;' and if Mr. Ruskin had established, by an apparently infrangible chain of logic, that the effect, which almost all besides himself have acknowledged, had no existence capable of being accounted for, we should not feel ourselves at all fettered by his conclusion, on calling to mind the upward cataract of shafts, and mouldings, and canopied figures which left us breathless when we first found ourselves before the piers of Cologne Cathedral. Mr. Ruskin has probably been sickened, as we have been, by the sentimental ravings on the subject of Gothic symbols, put forth by Puseyite clergymen, and some others whose studies should have taught them better: but however much and justly we may despise and ridicule any attempt to revive the whole system of mediæval symbolism for modern use, we ought not to forget that the former existence of that system is no mere theory, but an indisputable fact of history. The '*Rationale Divinorum Officiorum*,'

of Durandus, — a big folio, which, during half a century of the very prime of Gothic architecture, continued to be bought and read, as only such works as ‘Copperfield’ and ‘Vanity Fair’ are now, — affords unanswerable evidence of the extravagant tendency which then prevailed to symbolise on every possible occasion. It was so characteristic of the times, that we should err strangely were we to measure the impression which symbolical representations are likely to have produced upon the credulous and imaginative church-goers of the middle ages, by that which similar representations are calculated to exercise upon the fashionable, well-informed, and impatient congregations of St. George’s or St. James’s. While, however, we would discard from modern use the whole mediæval system of *arbitrary* symbolisation, we believe that we should be doing an injustice to Gothic architecture were we to refuse, with Mr. Ruskin, to perceive in its ancient examples an *artistic and essential* symbolism, which must retain its efficiency as long as the human mind retains its present constitution. That the effect of ascendant vigour was valued by the Gothic architects at a rate which can only be accounted for by assuming that they fully appreciated its admirable fitness in the Christian Temple, is proved, we think, by their constant subordination of all elements, *even that of arbitrary symbolism*, to this effect. For example, the orthodoxy of the well-known symbol of the triple lancet window was constantly destroyed, for the advantage of the all-important aspiration, by the superior height of the middle lancet. Another and equally conclusive proof that the Gothic architects were conscious of and valued themselves highly upon the characteristic Gothic forms, entirely apart from their constructive capacities, is provided by a practice which Mr. Ruskin reprobates as contrary to his law of excluding ‘imitations of ‘architecture’ from the material of architectural decoration. ‘This law,’ he says, ‘is greatly violated by those curious examples of Gothic, both early and late, in the North, in which the ‘minor features of the architecture were composed of small models ‘of the larger . . . abuses which strike me with renewed surprise ‘whenever I pass beneath a portal of the thirteenth century ‘Northern Gothic, associated as they are with manifestations of ‘exquisite feeling and power in other directions.’ Probably the distinction which we have drawn between decoration, as Mr. Ruskin understands the word, and means of architectural expression, will induce the reader to judge more favourably than Mr. Ruskin has done concerning these and many other details of the Northern-Gothic style. We would gladly discuss the highly interesting question of the sources of appropriate beauty in



Gothic cusps and foliations; but as Mr. Ruskin, though he gives a most ingenious account of the constructive origin of the cusp, says little about its decorative effect, and as these features form no part of the kind of expression which we undertook to investigate, namely, that which owes its existence to main constructional peculiarities, we forego the discussion of this point, and hasten to make a few remarks on the claims of 'Italian Gothic.'

Here we must take part with Hope, Gally Knight, Willis, Lord Lindsay, and others, against Mr. Ruskin. The Italians evidently adopted the forms of pointed architecture from the North with great reluctance; they systematically deprived those forms of their expressional powers, in order to subdue them, as far as possible, to a compatibility with the characteristic effects of the preceding style. Shafts and mouldings were maimed in their upward flight by horizontal bands of colour. Arch mouldings, in the North always plain and uninterrupted, sometimes received a further check by being carved and jointed, and by the marking of their separate voussoirs. The pointed arch was constantly mixed up with or enclosed by the semicircle and other figures which destroyed its natural expression. The Northern improvements on the Lombard bases and capitals were not admitted. Low roofs and low pediments, the detachment of the campanile from the body of the church; decoration by rich and various material, rather than by pure form; and many other means of anti-Gothic effect, conspired to spoil 'Italian Gothic' for temple architecture, and to make us regret its substitution for the noble and consistent Lombard style.

But out of this secularisation, if we may so call it, of the Northern Gothic, arose, perhaps, the most beautiful style of palatial architecture that the world has seen. Its purest and loveliest examples are the ancient palaces of Venice. Although we believe that Mr. Ruskin has greatly overrated the relative importance of these buildings in the scale of architectural merit, he has no doubt done very valuable service by calling attention to them; and we are glad to know that he has already awakened a lively interest upon the subject among practical men. We believe that a façade, like that of the Palazzo Foscari, the Ca' d' Oro, or the Palazzo Pisani, would meet with a degree of sympathy and appreciation from the dwellers in the North, which will never be awarded by them to any Greek, Roman, or Renaissance house-architecture, however admirable such architecture may have been in its time and climate.

Let us, however, before concluding, put forth a plea or two for the practitioners of what Mr. Ruskin calls 'the pestilent art of the Renaissance.'

Mr. Ruskin treats the Italian Renaissance architects as if they were the inventors of the various 'barbarisms' with which he charges their style; the truth is, that they found all the most outrageous and particular barbarisms to which he alludes already invented in the remains of late Roman work; and that they adopted them in the blind belief, prevalent at the time, that to be Roman and to be perfect was one and the same thing. It is also to be remembered, that these men were totally ignorant of pure Greek art. Consequently they must have been at an enormous disadvantage, as compared with ourselves, if ever they were sufficiently heterodox to endeavour to form an estimate of the real merits or demerits of the corrupted reminiscences of it in Roman art: and they could thus build, and the people enjoy what beauty their buildings possessed, without being shocked, as we continually are, by having the absent and exquisite chastity of Greek architecture everywhere suggested by misapplied Greek details. When the architects of this school dared to be original, they often succeeded in producing very noble works. It would be difficult to speak too highly of the excellent good sense and true feeling of Palladio. There is a degree of beauty about some of his designs, for which, as in all works of real genius, we are at a loss fully to account; and it must be confessed, that his constructive barbarisms, — such as rusticated shafts, brackets in the form of triglyphs, strongly expressed voussoirs, with no weight above them to justify their emphasis, generally constitute parts of a harmony, which we are disposed to value far above the irreproachable and uninteresting accuracies of some of our modern purists.

Of all the complaints — some of them very just — which Mr. Ruskin brings against this school, none are so vehement, and, we think, so ill-founded, as that which he urges against the system of 'wall decoration' by 'rustic-work.' As this is a point to which the Renaissance architects attached great importance, and one to which modern critics have paid little attention, we may be allowed to detain the reader with a few words of explanation and defence. There are three principal kinds of rustication, called technically 'frosted,' 'vermiculated,' and 'chamfered.' The two former and least important consist merely in leaving or making rough the visible surfaces of the stones, except at the margins, where they are chiselled smooth; by the last method, the stones, whether rough or smooth, are bevelled, or 'chamfered,' at their edges. All these devices have one main end, which is to exhibit the structure of the walls, by marking the junctions of the stones; and, to this end, the third

mode adds a capacity to express, by the depth or shallowness of the bevelling, different degrees of thickness in the wall; since, the beholder naturally and instantly concludes that its thickness is always great enough to render insignificant the loss of power which is produced by cutting away the edges of its stones. Now there is no end to the variety of interest, though it may not be very high, and of expression, though not, perhaps, of the most subtle kind, which the Renaissance architects produced by this last species of rustic-work in wall surfaces, more especially in those of the basement stories, of which the masonry is obviously required to be strongest, and where, therefore, the chamfered mode is most appropriate. Most Renaissance basements are elaborately and successfully studied for this special object. The nature of a basement excluded, for the most part, the barbarous traditional decorations which were apt to disfigure the *bel étage*; thus freer scope was left in it for dwelling on intelligent arrangement, and for displaying the living powers of gravitation and resistance in the stones. In the basement of the Palace of Charles the Fifth in the Alhambra, built by 'the Spanish Michel Angelo,' Alonzo Berruguette, every stone has its distinct office, and is unlike the one next to it; yet the whole is simple in effect, and capable of being comprehended at a glance. The basement of the Strozzi Palace, Florence, is divided by apertures into eight equal surfaces of wall, numbering in no case more than seven blocks, yet each differing from all the others in arrangement. It would require a volume to go through the constructive problems *visibly* solved in the exhibited masonry of the Renaissance. The practice of Rustication would, we think, have been sufficiently justified had it stopped at the production of this excellent and essentially architectural effect; but the exhibition of masonry answered another and even more important end,—one which was considered by the Greek architects of the best time as worth obtaining at a very large expense of labour. They polished the edges of the frustra of shafts so carefully, that the junctions became literally invisible; but they were just as careful to mark the *horizontal* layers of the wall masonry, and so to obtain those lines, which, 'on the Bank,' Mr. Ruskin says, 'may be considered as typical of accounts,' but which, in any other position, he regards in the light of mere disfigurements. The Greek architect did this in order to render the wall a foil to the all-important columns, by depriving it of all chance of being supposed to share in their activity. Now Renaissance rustication performs the same office of contrasting the naturally active expression of the shafts, by the naturally passive expres-

sion of the wall; but the wall-lines are commonly much broader and deeper than in the Greek, and are also perpendicular as well as horizontal, because the wall itself has an independent power and importance, which in Greek architecture it had not. Mr. Ruskin objects against the system of displayed masonry, that Nature leaves her mountain bases smooth. Now, if we were prepared to receive this doctrine, of requiring antitypes in Nature for all that the architect expresses by his work, we should still hold that the Renaissance architects were not thereby condemned in their common practice, which was to justify any unusual *lowness* in their edifices, by an appearance of unusual massiveness, obtained by increasing the force of the chamfered rustication. We readily admit, however, that the Renaissance method of giving expression to the wall is gross and tautological, when compared with the Lombard system of wall decoration. The baldest wall is far better than a surface badly or unnecessarily rusticated, as it often was, in imitation of some Roman example or other, by the Renaissance architects, and as it commonly is, with no such excuse, by modern builders.

In closing this brief and very imperfect elucidation of certain sources of effect in the principal styles of architecture, we must remind our readers that we have noted only the points of difference between Mr. Ruskin and ourselves. The points upon which we heartily coincide with him would have occupied, in their enumeration, far more space than we can afford to devote to them. The 'Seven Lamps' and the 'Stones of Venice' are works abounding in interest and value, for the general reader as well as for architects. The latter will do well to forego, for once, their customary scorn of non-professional criticism, and to remember, that a work is not necessarily worthless and unlearned because much that it teaches has never been taught before; and that it is not necessarily impractical, because it chiefly busies itself about the deep and half-forgotten foundations, which are common to all arts, and are therefore best discovered and discoursed of by a man who is devoted to no one of them in particular.

It is to civil architecture, especially that of Venice, that Mr. Ruskin has given his chief attention and warmest sympathy; and it is, we believe, to civil architecture that criticism ought at present to be chiefly devoted. Ecclesiastical architecture is taking among us its own course. Some persons doubt whether it is on the best path; yet it is now so far gone in it, that criticism has no longer much chance of seriously affecting it. Church builders do at last adhere to certain general principles. We might complain, that for the most part,—like the Pre-Raphaelites we have heard so much of,—they choose to imi-

tate the buds instead of the blossoms of mediæval Gothic, preferring that which is generally, though with questionable right, called the 'Early English,' and even in some instances retrograding still further into the late Lombard style. But mediæval architecture, of one sort or another, is at present the fixed ecclesiastical mode; and architects of late years are become fervent in the study, not only of ancient examples, but also of the principles by which their designers, consciously or unconsciously, were guided. It would be a great thing for civil architecture if the same unity and zeal could be awakened in its professors; and we confess that we do not share the despondency which Mr. Ruskin seems to feel, and which it is the fashion to express, concerning the prospects of this department of the art. It is quite true that new conditions of feeling and perception, in the people as well as in architects, are indispensable to a revival of the art. These conditions have arisen, in some faint but real degree, in the case of church architecture; but, in spite of some great exceptions, the civil branch of this noble art remains almost as lifeless and insipid as ever. People cannot at once resolve to perceive and feel; and, as the excellent maxim, '*omnis boni principium intellectus cogitabundus*,' is one of the truths which are at present fallen into disuse, there exists little faith in the utility of critical efforts to bring the public and architects to feel and perceive. That, however, which has been done by criticism in one case may be done by it in the other. In church architecture, what we have been taught to understand we have come to feel, and through feeling, in some measure, to create anew.

It is the present custom to underrate the value of artistical criticism, as much as in the days of our fathers there was a tendency to overrate it. The word 'inspiration,' as applied to art and the artist, has been subjected to the grossest misuse. Many people would persuade themselves and others, that all true artists have been the wildest of fanatics. If you give Shakspeare or Michel Angelo credit for having known something of what they were about when they produced their works, you are accused of degrading art into handicraft. It is not enough to allow that the modesty and simplicity of the great artist, together with the consciousness of the ease with which he has worked, may generally have prevented him from knowing how excellent and unapproachable his work would appear to others; he must also have been wholly unaware of the laws by which he has worked, if, indeed, it will be admitted by objectors of this class that works of art are produced according to any laws at all. Every thing which is known of art and artists goes to contradict this way of thinking. Most men, if not all,

who have become for ever famous through art, have been profound and solid thinkers. If they have been 'enthusiastic,' their enthusiasm has grown out of the 'intellectus cogitatus.' Theirs has been no such lawless and giddy impulse as is vulgarly affirmed,—less, we imagine, with the real desire of honouring artists, than under the mistaken notion that we bring them nearer our own level, by assuming that methods of production, which we can hardly and seldom wholly understand, were equally unintelligible to the artists themselves. We dwell upon this the more positively, because, whatever apparent grounds there may be for maintaining the fanatic theory with respect to artists, whose every work is in some sort unique and unrepeated, it is manifestly absurd when it comes to be applied to the ancient architects. Granting the assumption, that all great poems, paintings, and musical compositions may have been 'psychological curiosities,'—as remarkable as the opium exhalation, 'Kubla Khan,'—it is too much to believe that a hundred allied corporations of Freemasons, simultaneously working in as many diverse parts of the world, were, not only every one of them, unconsciously and plenarily inspired, but that they were all of them so inspired with one and the same idea.

---

ART. IV.—1. *Fifteenth Report of the Inspectors of Prisons for the Home District.*

2. *Report from the Select Committee on Prison Discipline.* 1850.

3. *Etudes sur les Colonies Agricoles, &c., &c.* Par MM. DE LURIEU et H. ROMAND. Paris: 1851.

4. *Transportation not necessary.* By C. B. ADPERLY, Esq. M.P.

5. *Rapport du Comité du chambre des députés sur les jeunes Détenus.* Decembre, 1849.

6. *Reformatory Schools.* By MARY CARPENTER. 1851.

7. *Education, as a Means of preventing Destitution.* By W. ELLIS. London: 1851.

8. *The Dwellings of the Poor, and the Means of improving them.* By MONTAGU GORE. London: 1851.

WHAT shall we do with our *Juvenile Delinquents*? is a question often asked, but as yet most unsatisfactorily and variously answered: 'Punish them more effectually,' says one class of philosophers, 'and so deter.' 'Educate them better,' says another class, 'and so prevent.' 'Open houses of refuge and 'asylums,' says a third party, 'and so reform'!

But prisons multiply and are better regulated; Juvenile Offenders' Acts are passed and boys whipped by the hundred—The Schoolmaster walks abroad enlightening our youth on Geography, History, the Steam Engine and Social Science—Ragged Schools and Refuges increase, and eloquent Chairmen and Treasurers rejoice in speaking of thousands of vagabonds and thieves, enlisted under the banners of the Ragged School Union, and its dependent establishments. And still, in spite of all, the vexing fact of a large amount of juvenile delinquency remains—and the young offender gains ground upon us, the plague of the policeman, the difficulty of the magistrate, a problem to the statesman, and a sorrow to the philanthropist.

That the question,—What shall be done with this class of criminals? presses for a practical reply, a few statistical details will show. It ought not naturally to be the age of crime. But the number of young persons under 17 years of age who were confined in the year 1849, as given in the 15th Report of the Inspector for the Home District, amounted to 17,126; 14,569 being males, and 2557 females. Of these 2257 were convicted at the Sessions or Assizes, and 10,251 were summarily convicted; the remainder being either acquitted or not prosecuted, or left for trial at the end of the year. There were, in fact, 12,508 boys and girls punished for crime in that year. These figures apply to the whole of England. The results of similar inquiry within the Metropolitan-police district (that is, within London and its vicinity, exclusive of 'the city,') are as well calculated to arrest attention. In 1849, the number of young persons *under 20 years* of age, convicted summarily or committed for trial, was 8203, of whom 75 were under 10, and 1473 between 10 and 15: while in 1850, the number under 20 amounted to 8261, of whom 68 were under 10, and 1785 between 10 and 15,—showing an increase, be it remarked, of 308, or of above one-fifth on the number of the classes below 15 years of age as compared with the results of the year previous.

From 14 to 15,000 boys and youths under 17 years of age are thus brought annually before the tribunals of our country, charged with offences against the law; of whom near *two-fifths* are carrying on their criminal career in the very streets of London. Nor is this all: these figures only give us *the earlier symptoms* of the *disease*, and *only the more immediate and tangible*. The vicious boy is but the father of the vicious and dangerous man. Few who enter this way of death, ever depart from it; and the burglar who disturbs our midnight slumbers so unpleasantly, and the skilful pickpocket who abstracts our purse and watch so provokingly, are but the juvenile offender developed to full growth and stature. And still fur-

ther, in our mixed and multiform society, no man liveth for himself, or dieth for himself: each individual criminal has a sphere of influence (or rather infection), small perhaps, but certain. Each is the centre of a circle of sympathising and gradually emulous admirers and associates, whose tendencies for the thief's life he fosters, develops, and directs. Reckon but five of such satellites of crime to every juvenile delinquent, and we have a mass of at least 50,000 depraved and vicious lads, professionally living on the plunder and injury of society. Such facts speak for themselves, and may well set us thinking deeply on our social prospects and responsibilities; and difficult as the subject is, and intricate as are the questions of legal interference, of social responsibility and of religious duty which it involves, the state and proper penal treatment of juvenile offenders, are points which must be felt to press imperatively on the attention of our Government and our Legislature.

In asking our readers to discuss with us the features of youthful crime, its causes and remedies, we feel we are not inviting them to an attractive subject. It must be owned, that the first impression which early depravity leaves on the mind is one of repulsion and disgust. It is hard, indeed, to realise a spectacle more sad and shocking than that which the *practised boy-thief* presents: often but a child in years, he is a man in knowingness and profligacy; a pickpocket, pilferer, or utterer of base coin by profession, he enters on and pursues his trade of shame and guilt for the sake of the sensual luxuries and indulgences it brings him, and for the adventure, excitement; and distinction it affords. He is emphatically dead in sin. Speak to him of reformation—of admission to some house of refuge, where in labour and comparative abstinence he may work out his emancipation and recovery—his answer will probably be, ‘Thank you, Sir, I can do something *better than that*.’ He supposes, and allows perhaps, that he will be transported at last; but in his sight this prospect is distant and uncertain, only,—meanwhile he knows how to enjoy himself and means to do it. We turn from such a picture of premature depravity as from something loathsome.

Yet look a moment over the records of his previous life, and trace what has made this moral deformity what we see it. He was not always the wilful self-condemned outcast from honesty and goodness he is now! It was his lot, perhaps, to be reared from the very dawn of life, if not in the Rookery, perhaps in places as bad, amidst scenes of filth and violence and vice, which dulled every moral sense and debased every thought and feeling. The blow and the curse were his first catechism, cheating and



lying his earliest lessons. At an age when the children of the wealthy would be carefully tended, and on no account allowed to leave the precincts of the nursery, he was sent out to beg or pilfer, beaten if unskilful or unlucky, rewarded and praised if clever and successful. He had, it may be, brutal and unnatural parents, who traded in their children's depravity, and locked them in the cellar or garret after they had despoiled them of the fruits of their dishonesty and begging; careless whether they lived or died, while they themselves revelled in the gluttony and drunkenness which their children's crimes had purchased. Or he was the child of a first marriage, and became the object of a step-father's ill usage or a step-mother's neglect, and was forced into the streets, an alien from his natural home, to starve or steal. Or he has been from his yet opening childhood an orphan, and has lived for years on his own resources, supported by the few pence per day he could earn by an errand or a crossing, eked out by what he stole when opportunity occurred. Living as he has thus done, cared for by none, taught no social duty, instructed in no faith, knowing no moral aim or motive, what can be expected from him, but that which he is and does? what can be looked for in him, but the daring ruffian or sneaking thief, who regards the great questions of vice and virtue, honesty and honour, truth and falsehood, as mere matters of circumstance; who calls his crimes misfortunes, their punishment his ill-luck: who recognises no goodness but what fills his pocket, no evil but that which puts him in the hands of the police?

But has society no share in the condemnation and the guilt of this lost soul? Has the law, which is so prompt and stern in punishing the child, but which leaves unpunished, nay unchallenged, and even civilly unliable, the drunken, vicious, cruel parent, by whom the child was forced into the gulf of crime, nothing to answer for? Are not the authorities who have contentedly allowed such haunts of wickedness and infamy as he was bred in, to continue in the very heart of our great towns, and whose indifference to the physical and moral circumstances of the lower classes of our labouring poor, has fostered these nurseries and schools of crime, part authors and abettors of the boy's depravity? Such questions open a fearful account against society. They compel us to feel that one, whose degradation and corruption are more our doings than his own, has the strongest claims on our compassion, even while he is heavily condemned by what we necessarily call our justice. Nay, they do more; they show us that by enforcing education, decency, and cleanliness of habits, and parental responsibility among our

lowest poor, much might be done to lessen the amount of juvenile delinquency, and many hundreds saved to usefulness and happiness, who are now left the helpless prey of vice and misery, constituting the most crying scandal to our existing manners, our institutions, and our general humanity, and—by a natural law of retributive justice, far more really just than that under which themselves may suffer,—certain to grow up a curse, and peril to the community.

But the young criminals of our cities and large towns are not wholly of this destitute and more pitiable class. In their ranks hundreds can be found who have had the advantage of respectable though poor parents, who have been reared in decent though humble homes; who have been sent to school betimes, and perhaps been put out in some little place, where they might earn their victuals, and which might serve as a stepping-stone to a better situation, or afford them the opportunity to learn some tolerably remunerative occupation. What has led this class to crime? Ask any of their number—the answer you will probably receive will be, ‘bad companions, Sir’! Truants from the school, lingerers on their errands, they have become the prey of the sharp and ripened criminals, who, like good missionaries of the devil, are ever watchful and anxious to recruit their ranks: The Scripture maxim, ‘evil communication corrupts good manners,’ is continually verified in this class. • The boy has been usually a good deal spoilt at home, his fancies and appetites indulged, his self-government and power of saying No to temptation altogether neglected and unexercised. He is a ready spoil to the spoiler, an easy booty to the artful rogue, who lures him by his love for pastry or amusements; and uses him as the monkey employed the cat, to filch the loaf, the joint, the gown-piece, or the roll of calico, which he points out to him from a distance, as too well known to venture near them himself.

Much has been done of late years, by the classification of criminals, to clear our gaols from the guilt of being schools of crime, in which juvenile delinquents graduated under the tuition of older and more hardened offenders. But there are earlier nurseries of corruption which remain at present unbroken up, and against which comparatively little has been attempted. The very dwellings of the poor are in too many instances preparatory training schools for the gaol. Nobody has better earned in teaching country landlords by example than the Duke of Bedford, the right of impressing on them by words, the obligations imposed on them to provide suitable residences for their cottagers. It is a grave moral question even in the country. What then is it in great towns? The reader will learn in Mr.

Beemes' 'Rookeries of London,' and in Mr. Montagu Gore's pamphlet on the 'Dwellings of the Poor,' that Saffron Hill and Church Lane, St. Giles's, are not the only haunts where the process of unhumanising is going on, 'where all are taken in, 'who can pay their footing; where the thief and prostitute 'are harboured among those whose only crime is perhaps their 'poverty : ' where large families are to be found with only one bedstead between them, — sometimes not even this; where, in the upper room of a single house, let out piecemeal at enormous profits, as many as seventeen juvenile thieves, between the age of six and twelve, are collected and live together. What choice or chance can life propose for those, to whom a brutal receptacle of this kind has been their infancy's or boyhood's home?

Without doubt, however, whether the parents be discreet or foolish, indulgent or neglectful, there is much in the educational position, the school circumstances of this class of children in London and our great towns, which tends to lead them into crime, or at least exposes them to severe temptations; and which may therefore, in some measure, lead us to mingle mercy with censure in our estimate of their deserts, and stir us to devise remedies for the cause of the offence as well as punishment for the offence itself.

We take the following statement of a practical witness (the resident Chaplain of the Philanthropic) from the evidence given to the select Committee of the House of Commons on Prison Discipline last year.

'The great mass of juvenile criminals appear to me to be led into their vices and errors from the want of superintendence and industrial training. The parents have to go to their work, and must be occupied all day long, and these boys are left entirely on the streets. If your National Schools, which are merely open 4 days a week for 5 hours, and 2 days a week for 3 hours, were so arranged that a parent could take his child to the school in the morning and leave him there, with the certainty that he would be protected and looked after, and, to a certain extent, employed during the day, there would be a great check administered to the cause of juvenile crime. But what is the case. Twelve o'clock strikes, the children are all turned into the streets. The school is generally placed in one of the worst neighbourhoods, from the cheapness of the site. At two o'clock they come back to the school of themselves; and at four, or half-past four, are again turned out, at least an hour and a half before their parents can come from their work. With this exposure we cannot wonder that they are contaminated; bad associates, who are ever on the watch, get hold of them and lead them astray; first, merely to play the truant, afterwards to be petty thieves, and at last to be accustomed criminals.'

There is substantial truth in this representation, and truth

which we cannot but recommend to the consideration of our Clergy, and the managers of our National and British Schools. It is well worth considering whether these might not be so organised as to become a species of day Boarding-Schools for the labouring class, educational *Salles d'Asile*, in which the children of the working man might have the advantage of moral superintendence and control, such as would form good habits, as well as afford mental instruction for the stimulating their intelligence. The cost of the children's dinner might be paid for by the parents, the child either bringing its food with him, or being furnished with a plain wholesome meal in consideration of the parents contributing so much a week; and those who are conversant with the working classes of our towns, will, we believe, be disposed to say, that they would generally avail themselves of such an arrangement, and would be thankful to have their children *kept out of the streets* at the price of a moderate payment for their board. The cost of the additional service and superintendence could not be heavy; there is nothing novel or operose about it; while certainly it might be expected to be among the best practical preventive remedies for the evil we are treating of, as respects that class of juvenile offenders who have decent and industrious relatives, and who fall away in spite of care and good example at home, and not for want of it.

One powerful agent for the depraving the boyish classes of our population in our towns and cities is to be found in the cheap concerts, shows, and theatres, which are so specially opened and arranged for the attraction and ensnaring of the young. When for three-pence (or as till late for two-pence) a boy can procure some hours of vivid enjoyment from exciting scenery, music and acting, with funny songs, and amusing tricks of magic and dexterity, it must be owned that the temptation to acquire the pennies '*rectè si possit, sed quocunque modo*,' is a very powerful one. And when our national indifference or our fear of interfering with personal and public liberty, allows these shows and theatres to be scenes of the grossest indecency—training schools of the coarsest and most open vice and filthiness—it is not to be wondered at, that the boy who is led on to haunt them becomes rapidly corrupted and demoralised, and seeks to be the doer of the infamies which have interested him as a spectator. That we may not be thought to exaggerate the case, we would place before our readers the following short testimony of a most competent witness, Mr. Bishop, the agent or 'Minister to the poor' of the Liverpool Domestic Mission.

‘In company with a serjeant of police, in plain clothes, I visited fourteen of these concert saloons one Saturday night between the hours of nine and twelve. I will not attempt to explain in detail what I saw, but altogether it was a series of the most heart-sickening scenes I ever witnessed. In many of the rooms lads from about 13 to 18 years of age formed a considerable number of the audience; and in every instance I marked the presence of abandoned women. In one there were about 150 persons, a third of whom were boys. In another, a young woman, with a rouged face, dressed as a Swiss flower-girl, with a basket of flowers in her hand, was singing, while in a state of intoxication; and the extravagances occasioned by the excitement of the drink were the principal sources of amusement. This was a scene too disgusting, perhaps, to be dangerous; but in the better conducted rooms, where there is more attention to appearances, and a thin gauze of propriety thrown over all the scenes, every thing is calculated to deprave the taste, to intoxicate the senses, and to stimulate the passions.’

A yet plainer testimony is given in the Report of Mr. Clay, the excellent chaplain of Preston Gaol.

‘The principal singing room in this town (Preston) is capable of holding from 800 to 1000 persons: one end is fitted up as a stage. The bar, where the liquors are served out, is placed in the middle. The place between the bar and the stage is appropriated to juveniles, or boys and girls from 10 to 14 years of age; of them there were not less than 100—they were by far the noisiest portion of the audience, and many of the boys were drinking and smoking. The lower gallery, which extends round three parts of the room, was occupied by the young of both sexes, from 14 years and upwards. There could not be less than 700 individuals present, and about one-seventh of them females. The pieces performed encourage resistance to parental control, and were full of gross innuendoes, “double entendres,” cursing, emphatic swearing, and incitement to illicit passion. Three-fourths of the songs were wanton and immoral, and were accompanied by immodest gestures. The last piece performed was the “Spare Bed,” and we gathered from the conversation around that this was looked for with eager expectation. We will not attempt to describe the whole of this abominable piece: suffice it to say, that the part which appeared most pleasing to the audience was when one of the male performers prepared to go to bed. He took off his coat and waistcoat, unbuttoned his braces, and commenced unbuttoning the waistband of his trowsers, casting mock-modest glances around him; finally he took his trowsers off, and got into bed. Tremendous applause followed this act. As the man lay in bed, the clothes were pulled off; he was then pulled out of bed and rolled across the stage. After this he walked up and down the stage; and now the applause reached its climax—loud laughter, shouting, clapping of hands, by both males and females, testified the delight they took in this odious exhibition.’

Let but our readers consider the character and number of these places, of which there are said to be forty in Liverpool alone, and probably much above a hundred in London and its suburbs, and they will feel that it is indeed a grave consideration how far our laws and legislators must not be held responsible for the results, when such powerful agencies of demoralisation are left unchecked and uncontrolled.

We may here advert to another active element in fostering and developing Juvenile Delinquency,—the multitude, namely, of what are courteously called Marine Store dealers, a class which might more justly be entitled Licensed Receivers of stolen goods. Many of our readers have probably seen in the courts and back streets of our great city, the significant question, in good round hand or Roman capitals, ‘Do you want money?’ ‘come to the Black Doll and get it: 2d. per lb. for rags and ‘tailor’s trimmings. 1d. per lb. for paper. 6d. per lb. for horse-hair. 2d. for kitchen stuff.’ Something for anything and ‘everybody.’ But they must be like the poor destitute or tempted lads we have been describing, penniless in pocket and hungry in appetite, and already taught to long for and hanker after the smart and well-lighted room, where indulgence and amusement await them, to fully estimate the awful force of the temptation which such announcements offer. They set the page and the apprentice on stealing their master’s books, or tools, or bottles; the errand boy on pilfering the goods he carries home; the destitute hanger on the pavé upon filching the pewter pot, or bit of lead or brass, or the jacket, or the gown-piece, or the pair of boots which offer themselves so temptingly at the stall or shop front as they pass. No doubt, the case of the receivers of stolen property is one very difficult to deal with: no doubt the habitual carelessness of the small retail shopkeepers in exposing their goods so temptingly, particularly small articles of food and clothing, should be checked; but it may fairly be a question whether some system of supervision might not be carried out in reference to these marine store dealers so as to restrict the perfect license with which they now traffic in manifestly stolen property, and to repress the assurance with which they now invite and stimulate dishonesty.\*

Such is a rough outline of the circumstances of the juvenile offenders of our towns and cities, and the influences which enlist

---

\* An experienced police magistrate suggests that ‘Dealers in ‘Marine Stores’ should be required to keep a register of ALL THEIR PURCHASES; and that it should be made unlawful to purchase from any young person, or *after a fixed hour* in the evening, as is the case with the pawnbrokers.

and confirm them in their career; a career sure to end eventually in banishment, if not earlier cut short by disease, vice, want, and drunkenness.

In mining and agricultural districts, the amount of juvenile delinquency is comparatively small; in the two metropolitan counties, 3609 boys and girls under 17 were imprisoned in 1848 (of which number above 600 of the boys were whipped, under the Juvenile Offenders' Act), being in the ratio of 1 to 694 of the population. In the same year the number of such young offenders imprisoned in the manufacturing counties of Lancashire, Cheshire, Warwick, Derby, Leicester, and the West Riding of Yorkshire, was 3295, being one in every 1600 of the population. And the number imprisoned in the counties of Norfolk, Hampshire, Essex, Sussex, Kent, Devonshire, Dorset, Somerset, Gloucestershire, and the East Riding of Yorkshire, being districts with large maritime towns or watering places, was 2584, being 1 in every 1508 of the population; while the number in the five mining counties of Cornwall, Cumberland, Westmoreland, Durham, and Northumberland, was 619, being 1 in 2078 only of their population; and the number in the thirteen agricultural counties of Cambridge, Hereford, Huntingdon, Lincolnshire, Rutland, Salop, Suffolk, Wilts, Oxford, Berks, and Northampton, was 1087, being only 1 in 1947 of the population. A proportion, however, of juvenile delinquency does exist in all, mostly to be traced to the want of superintendence and healthful exertion of the mind in early childhood. The agricultural juvenile offender usually begins his course as a crow boy. The little fellow, whose lungs can expand enough to raise a shout, or whose hands can wield a clapper, is not allowed to idle his time away at school, where he can earn nothing, but is perched on a gate, in a hedge, or a tree, all day long, to frighten away birds, both at seed time and harvest, for which occupation he receives so many halfpence a week. He studies nature, and in due time becomes a wood and turnip stealer, and then a poacher, possibly supplied with a gun and ammunition for night-work by the receiver of the game. We fear, we must say, that the Union Houses have contributed their full share to the amount of juvenile delinquency. To quote the evidence of a witness before cited: 'With regard to country boys, we have had a great many cases in the Philanthropic School in which the boy seems to have been allowed to turn himself out of the workhouse at 14 or 15 years of age; because he was a little troublesome, the master has been glad to get rid of him; and in a few days or weeks he has been in prison. That boy would soon become a finished convict.'

This evidently refers mainly to orphans or deserted lads, whom the Union House should shelter till the parish authorities can procure them adequate and fit employment; but unhappily our parochial authorities both in town and country have thought too lightly of the responsibilities involved in the guardianship and treatment of the pauper child. Numerous instances could be given in which the juvenile delinquent has owed his initiation into crime to a short-sighted anxiety to save the rates: for economy's sake, the destitute boy has been associated with the adult profligate and idler in the house, or has been hastily apprenticed to an indifferent and unfit master, or has been permitted nay, often urged, to leave the House to look for work without the least prospect of employment. Still oftener, does it happen that the young offender is compelled to pursue his career of vagrancy and theft, even when under the influence of recent punishment or awakened shame, he is anxious to turn from it; because the parish officers, to whom the police magistrate refers him for protection, decline to do any thing for him till he 'can prove his settlement;' a condition which practically amounts to a sentence of direct rejection, — in fact, to go and steal again.

The recent outrages on the unfortunate Jane Willbred have aroused the attention of the Legislature to the unprotected condition of pauper apprentices *when bound*. We may hope that the present able and enlightened President of the Poor Law Board will ere long be enabled to enforce more attention to the young paupers' *early management and moral and industrial training*. The Bridgnorth Union School at Quatt shows what can be done, and at how moderate a cost, and with how useful a result. The recent opening of the North Surrey Schools at Penge, for the children of several adjacent Unions, is a hopeful symptom that the example of Bridgnorth is beginning to be appreciated, and that wiser and more practical views upon pauper education are making way among the guardians and parish authorities in other districts. But, looking at the rejection of propositions to introduce industrial and especially agricultural training in several county Unions, it may be doubted whether some further legislative interference will not be required before the true and ultimately the cheaper system will be generally established, and the destitute and pauper child placed under such discipline and instruction as to remove him from the class of Juvenile Delinquents into whose ranks he is now so often driven.

We have, perhaps, said enough of the *causes and circumstances* of youthful crime. Let us turn to the more satisfactory side of



the subject, and consider its Remedies. Now, on this head, it may be held as certain, that do what we will, adopt whatever system we like, whether of penalty or prevention, a certain amount of juvenile crime will always infallibly exist among us. Till, indeed, all parents do their duty, and all parish officers act up to their responsibility, and all laws and regulations bearing on the employment and the treatment of the young are made wholly just, and morally effective, a certain average proportion of thefts and misdemeanours by children will always exist; but it is a different question, whether we shall have such a proportion as 16,000 prisoners in a year under 17 years of age out of our population, or whether we shall have 5000 or 1000. And while it would be the dream of an Utopian to expect that no boys should be found thieves or vagabonds, it must be a common object with all who take interest in the happiness of their fellow creatures, from the man of common humanity to the philosopher and the practical statesman, to reduce their number within the lowest limits the case admits.

That it is our social negligence and the defects of our penal and educational discipline which give so large a number as 11,000 young offenders punished by imprisonment or whipping in one year, and not any inevitable law of nature or population, the far smaller proportion obtaining in France may serve to show. We find from the report of the Special Committee of the National Assembly presented Dec. 1849, that the whole number of children prosecuted before the correctional tribunals throughout the year 1847 (in which year the last general returns were made up) amounted to 10,204, while the number undergoing imprisonment, including those detained by way of paternal correction, at the instance of their relatives, was, in 1849, about 11,400. If it be considered that the law of France sentences juvenile offenders to far longer periods of confinement than is usual in England,—so that in 1849 there were above 2000 juveniles sentenced in France to upwards of twelve months' imprisonment, either as convicts or *détenus*, a number at least ten times as great as that to which the juveniles under 16 transported or sentenced to above twelve months' imprisonment in England in the same year amounted—the relative proportions of juvenile crime to the population in England and in France respectively must appear very favourable to the latter country. Taking the nearest approximated amounts of the population of the two countries in 1849, it would appear that there were nearly *twice* as many commitments and punishments for offenders under 17 in England as in France,—a circumstance, the explanation of

which we cannot find in the superior educational or religious advantages of France, and which must probably be referred to the different systems of penal treatment adopted in the two countries. This difference, in a few words, amounts to this—that in England the Juvenile Delinquent is punished over and over again with a whipping and *short imprisonment*; whereas in France the majority of young offenders under 16 years are sentenced to lengthened periods of *educational or correctional detention* (periods varying from three to five, or even ten years, according to the greater youth of the party concerned), as, having acted, ‘sans discernement,’ i. e. as being too young, and too ill-taught and reared, to be justly held *responsible* for their actions. Thus, out of 3769 young offenders sentenced to imprisonment, *penal or educational*, in 1847, 1757 only were ‘condamnés,’ as responsible, and 2012 were ‘acquittés,’ but ordered to be detained for lengthened periods of reformatory confinement, as not responsible. On this the contrast between the two countries, and their respective penal systems as regards the young, practically hinges. In England, the *boy*, however young, is dealt with on the *same footing* and by the *same rule* as the man. If he is convicted of unlawfully possessing goods, of assaults on the police, of vagrancy, he is handed over to the house of correction for the same term as the adult offender by his side is sentenced to for similar transgressions. He is removed in the same van, and, in many prisons, still works in the same room, and shares substantially the same treatment. In France he is recognised at once as the subject of a different system, as belonging to an exceptional and separate class. His youth, the neglect and ignorance he has been reared in, the force of the bad influences exerted on him, are all taken into account. He is punished and withdrawn from the *society* which he is injuring; but the whole form and substance of the proceeding shows that its principle is prevention. He is withdrawn to be placed under such training and discipline as may develop the good that lies hid and buried in him, and repress the evil which has so prematurely sprung up and overshadowed it. With us the boy may pass half of each year in a prison, for three or four years running, but uniformly for *short terms*; which make the terrors of the gaol familiar, while they give no chance to the moral agencies, that are at work within it, to exert a reformatory action on him. The boy has snatches of education, short glimpses of what self-control, and order, and decency might do for him; but the scene changes, and the good influence is removed, before a single habit can be formed, or even any deep resolution, or new principle matured. It is

only at the end of his career that he obtains the correctional advantages which the French boy met with at the outset of his course. He is at last *transported*,—that is, in reality, sent to Parkhurst prison, and placed in a school of enlarged instruction and severe discipline for three years, with the prospect of being then transferred to a penal colony under a ticket of leave, if fairly improved and reformed; but by the time he arrives at this happy termination, he has been for many years familiarised with vice and crime, and the sensual enjoyments which they yield. The ultimate consignment to detention and continuous training comes fearfully late. Instead of rescuing an half-initiated novice, on the verge of falling but not yet fallen, his sentence comes in but to struggle with, and, if possible, reform and cure, a long practised, deliberate, and experienced offender; whose moral transformation at that stage is a thing usually to be desired rather than expected.

Of the extent to which the system of repeated short imprisonments is carried in this country, many of our readers have no idea. We could quote instances in our knowledge of boys not yet 13 years old who have been 10 or 12 times inmates of a gaol. But the return laid before the Prison Discipline Committee by Mr. Osborne, the zealous chaplain of Bath gaol, speaks most plainly and emphatically. 55 boys committed to that prison for the first time in 1844 were known to have been re-committed to that or other prisons 206 times, or nearly 4 times each in the course of the 5 following years. At the end of that period 15 of the 55 were transported, 30 were still living a life of crime,—preparing, that is, for the same end; 5 had died. Again, of 283 juveniles, inmates of Bath gaol for thefts, misdemeanours, &c. (excluding tramps), in 6 years, ending 1849, 52 were committed twice, 75 thrice, 9 four times, 12 five times, 19 seven or more times. In the Report of the Inspector of Prisons for the Home District, already quoted, we find that of the whole number, 12,508, stated to have been convicted in the year 1849, 2125 had been convicted previously *once*, 944 *twice*, 484 *thrice*, 761 *four times and upwards*.

Our readers ask, perhaps, why is such a system continued? Why not adopt a method of correction for the younger classes of offenders, which, while it punished, might improve, and so might turn them from the path of vice in time, and lead them to courses happier to themselves and less hurtful to society? To this question the answer lying on the surface, is,—first, because the system has been long established, and our judges, magistrates, and lawyers are not ‘given to change;’ and, secondly, because every measure contemplating more reforma-

tory and preventive action, which has been hitherto proposed, has appeared to be so beset with difficulties, that our statesmen have found it easier to reject, than to minutely consider and amend it with a view to its practical adoption.

But on going a little deeper, the two great impediments in the way of a general adoption of reformatory treatment of juveniles, are found to be

1st. Economical objections on the score of the expense that would be incurred.

2nd. Moral objections on the score of the real or apparent inducements which any really reformatory training might offer, in the first place, to juvenile offenders themselves to adopt a criminal career as a means of obtaining livelihood, instruction, and provision; and, next, to their friends and relatives to neglect or pervert them, for the purpose of shifting the burden of their maintenance and education from themselves on the more honest and conscientious part of the community.

These grounds of objection meet us so continually at the very basis of every discussion on the subject, that it will be worth while to carefully consider them.

The first, though to the ears of the taxed and tax-impatient Englishman, it sounds the most serious, is in reality the most easily disposed of. A careful estimate of the expenses incidental to our present system of repeated short convictions, seems to establish the conclusion, that it is fully as expensive to the ratepayer as any more reformatory method, *when adopted generally*, would be. We hesitate, indeed, to adopt the liberal calculations which Mr. Osborne, whose evidence we have already quoted, appended to his statement on the re-convictions of the juvenile offenders in Bath gaol, in which he supposes 5000 to be the number of juveniles annually committed for the first time, and estimates the cost of the present method of treatment at a million of pounds per annum; first, because we doubt whether more than half that number of boys is annually RECRUITED into the criminal ranks; and, secondly, because we think the estimate of expenses incidental to every criminal's career, in the way of prosecutions, costs of trial and punishment, and amount of property destroyed or stolen, at 200*l.* per head, a very large one. But, on the other hand, the Report and calculations of the late lamented Mr. Rushton, on the cases of a number of youths whose career he was able to trace in Liverpool, make it probable that, first and last, the cost of each juvenile offender is not less than 100*l.*, and, taking the reduced number of 2000 as the annual addition to the criminal class of boys, we see reason to believe that the price which the country

pays for its present system is not less than from *two to three hundred thousand pounds per annum*,—a sum which applied to the maintenance and correctional training of our young criminals, taken in the earlier stages of their career, would certainly more than suffice to feed and educate, and dispose of the hopeful and improvable portion of them in some way useful to the community. This expenditure, so applied, would both greatly lessen the general amount, and therefore the general cost of crime, by arresting its propagation among the younger classes of our population; and would give us in return for our expenditure, not *two thousand convicts* unreformed, or *half reformed*, to be maintained and transported to a penal colony at last, but fourteen or fifteen hundred *decent hopeful citizens*, producers as well as consumers of the fruits of industry: workers and examples of that which is good and useful to their fellow men. Indeed, if all which the inhabitants of our large towns and populous districts pay or lose through the crimes of boys, whom our laws are now content with prosecuting and punishing so ineffectually, could be collected into one bag, and the expense of such juvenile houses of correction, or penal schools, as would be required to place the mass of our youthful offenders under wholesome reformatory discipline for lengthened periods, were to be put into another, we feel confident that the exchange of the former for the latter would be found by the honest housekeeper a profitable bargain. He would gain, not lose, even in a pecuniary point of view, by the reformatory system.

But the other difficulty, *i. e.* that reformatory training, generally followed out, and held up as a distinctive object of pursuit, would act as a premium or attraction to crime, rather than a remedy for it, or a repulsion from it, is not quite so readily dispatched. That it would operate in such a way on the juvenile offender himself, or on boys of his age and class, we do not believe. We have never found any lad anxious to go to Parkhurst, unless, indeed, it be after a long and bitter experience of the pains and penalties of the criminal career, and its vicissitudes of want and wretchedness, and when the solitude of Pentonville was the alternative. And inquiry of the conductors of what reformatory institutions we have, leads to the conclusion that the difficulty they have to struggle with, is not to keep boys out of them, but to persuade and influence them to stay in them when admitted. The discipline and employment of Juvenile Houses of Correctional Training might easily, as they should rightly, be made sufficiently strict and laborious to ensure their not presenting bribes or inducements to any one to qualify for admission into them.

But the case is different as regards the relatives. There are, probably, many families in the classes from which the majority of our juvenile offenders spring, where the step-father or step-mother, or the uncle or aunt, or even the child's own selfish and unprincipled parent, would gladly lay hold of any means of throwing the burden and responsibility of the boy's maintenance and instruction as much as possible on any but themselves. Even here, however, such experience as Parkhurst and the Reformatory Asylums which we possess, supply, goes to qualify the general inference we might have drawn; and to show that, at least at present, whatever be the advantages held out, if they are to be purchased at the price of entire separation from the boy, and of the loss of his services, there are few of this class of parents who will be affected by the temptation.\*

But we would ask those who are so vividly impressed with the notion that a reformatory system of correction will present so dangerous a premium on parental neglect, to consider what a direct premium, not only on the neglect, but on the depravation, of the boy, the present merely penal system of correction offers. This is too little thought of. But let our readers remember that vicious parents have now only to leave their child uncared for and exposed to vile associates, to at once have him maintained for half his boyhood at the public cost in prison; while during the intervals of his imprisonments they can have him with them at home, and can profit by the produce of his thefts, and be partially maintained by the plunder which, during his months of liberty, he is free to gather from the shops or pockets of their neighbours. Let it be considered, also, that such parents have no horror at what our philanthropic writers call 'the prison brand.' To have been in Newgate or Tothill Fields is, in their eyes, no disgrace; and they have the consolation to fall back upon, that the boy will be educated and provided for by the Government at Parkhurst at last. Surely the penal school, and its entire separation of the boy for years, at an earlier and more hopeful stage, can offer no greater bribe than this?

After all, however, the question practically is, — cannot our

---

\* The evidence of the late Mr. Rushton, before the Committee of the House of Lords in 1847, and his letters to the Liverpool Town Council (1850), afford some remarkable illustrations of what we have here advanced. It would be hard to over-estimate the loss which the cause of reformatory treatment for the young offender has sustained in this able magistrate's decease. By his interest in the subject, his accurate records and careful investigations of the numerous cases that came before him, he was well qualified to be its ablest, as well as its most earnest, champion.

schools for correction of young offenders be so organised as effectually to oppose and neutralise the tendency and inducement to abuse them? To which may be added the supplemental question, whether, as our present checks and precautions seem inadequate to prevent crime, the gain to society, — that is to the tax and rate-paying community, — would not be greater on the whole, in the withdrawal of the child from friends and circumstances certain to eventually make him a criminal and a convict, a burden and a mischief, than the cost which can be incurred by precautionary interference?

Now, it does seem to us, that two or three very effectual checks might be devised to hinder and discourage the parties on whom the child is naturally dependent, from purposely or negligently qualifying him for the penal school. In the first place, let it be a principle, that the child be sent to a school at a distance from the place where his friends live, and his offences have been committed. This virtual transportation would be an immediate discouragement. It is this, we are told, which now checks the inclination of so many to avail themselves of the offered benefits of the Philanthropic.\*

In the second place, let a distinctly corrective character be given to the school. This is a point which we think in all respects is a most important one. For the sake of society, for the sake of the juvenile offender himself, there should be no playing with crime; no appearance of trifling with or making light of it. He who doeth wrong, should suffer for that wrong which he has done—such is the divine law; and such is the dictate or supposition of all human *justice*. There is too great a disposition among some classes of philanthropists to overlook this, and to speak of the criminal as if his faults were so wholly the result of unfavourable circumstances, as to make him an object of sympathy and compassion; a person to be comforted rather than corrected, petted rather than punished. Let there be nothing of this. Let the schools for the reception and reformation of delinquent children be, and be felt to be, schools of *correction*. Let them be called so, that there may be no possibility of mistake. Let the internal regulations be strict, the employ-

---

\* The chaplain says, in his evidence before the Committee of the House of Commons, 'The chaplains of Norwich and of Stafford Castles, and of Knutsford gaol, have repeatedly written to me to say, "We should be glad to send the boy; he wants to come, but "his father will not allow him." I had to send a boy back the whole way to Staffordshire because his step-mother interfered, and said, "Why should I part with him, to have the boy sent from and "transported to another place?"'

ment constant, and as laborious as the child's age will allow of. Out-door occupation, involving exposure to the weather and cold, and leaving a sense of muscular fatigue, is evidently to be preferred. Let the diet be studiously plain and coarse, and appropriate to country labour. Let there be no hot slops (cocoa, soups or gruel), but good household bread, and a full allowance of pork, cheese, and suet-pudding. Let there be no smart-looking attractive dress, but plain rough clothing. Let there be no 'high education,' with 'lectures on chemistry, illustrated 'with experiments,' no formation of bands and glee-singing classes, but only plain, useful and intelligent instruction, such as may place the boy on the fair level of the labouring class.

Any one who has studied the tastes and feelings of the young London thief, and has seen the disgust and discontent with which he turns for many weeks from the food which the honest agricultural labourer is thankful for, and the pleasure with which he enters into the warm school-room, and applies to its sedentary and mental occupations, will appreciate the use of these regulations. Again, let there be no making a show of the school; no benevolent committee-men, expressing their hope that the 'beef is good,' or that 'the boys are not overworked;' no philanthropic ladies asking to be shown the 'interesting 'cases,' and looking with the utmost admiration on the most hardened and guilty lads; no amateurs in crime, calling on the boys who have been 'three times in prison to stand up,' and then 'those four times in prison,' and then those five times, as if the conviction and imprisonment were so many medals of good service, or tokens of honourable danger and endurance. Let it be felt, and studiously avowed and shown, that the school is for cure, not reward. One of discipline, not privilege. All this is perfectly consistent with the presence of the spirit of kindness and religious influence, without which, as the predominating elements of the school system, no reformation, no moral training, could be hoped for. Influence, not force, must be the *moving power*; but influence must operate rather by the master's unwearied patience, by his self-denial, and his efforts to understand and reach the hearts of the children he has to train, than in the license he allows them, the sensual indulgence he affords their appetites, or the false sympathy which he expresses for their transgressions.

With our strong conviction that the school must wear its true aspect, and seem to be what it is designed to be, we can not at all coincide in the proposition of Mr. Adderley's pamphlet, that the juvenile offender should be sent to the common national school, and be mixed up indiscriminately with the children of



the poor at large. While it is highly undesirable to give the delinquent classes any sort of prominence, or to seem to afford them any peculiar advantages, it must certainly be far worse to make the parish school a lazaretto, and mix together the infected and the healthy: And, if the poor ratepayer, the father of honest children, is likely to think it hard that he should be taxed to provide good discipline and instruction to the neglected offspring of his vicious or unprincipled neighbour, he would (if we mistake not) think it harder still, that his decent and unconvicted child should be placed on the same bench with that neighbour's depraved and vicious son, to be contaminated, corrupted, and introduced to crime in the natural course of his daily education. At the same time the facility with which boys are discharged from our parish schools for trifling faults, and are thus cast into the stream of juvenile delinquency, is far too great; and it is well worthy the attention of school committees or trustees, whether, on the boys' admission they should not require the parents to agree to stricter measures in case of truancy or petty thefts, and punish and repress the fault in the school, instead of turning the delinquent into the streets where the fault must grow, and ere long bear fruit in heavier and less curable offences.

In the third place, let it be a principle that in every case where circumstances will in anywise allow of it, the *friends be charged with some contribution to the child's support in the reformatory school*. We are aware that we here touch on another of the vexed questions of juvenile delinquency. It is one on which, however, very little practical evidence has yet been taken. Of the abstract propriety that the parents and legal guardians of the offender should thus contribute towards the maintenance of the child, whom they are bound naturally wholly to support, there can be no doubt; and of the practical possibility of such a system being enforced, and acted on, in a far greater number of cases than is generally supposed, we are fully persuaded. It should of course be optional to the parties concerned, either to have the child sent away, and to contribute to his better training in the government school, or to take better care of him, and keep him out of the police court themselves. In the case of first and second offences of a lighter kind, they might even be allowed to try what they could do; and, after proper warning to them, and a proper chastisement to the offender, he might be restored to their charge, the first and the second time he came before the magistrate. But on the third conviction the option should cease. The child should then be committed for a sufficient period — twelve months or two years — to the school of reform,

and the magistrate be empowered and required to hold the friends responsible for a certain weekly payment proportioned to their means. In many cases the payment could not be practically enforced; but vigilance on the part of the officer to whom the collection of the payment was entrusted, would secure it in the great number of instances, if a proper machinery were uniformly adopted: the Relieving Officer of each union might be specially charged with this duty. The amount contributed by such means might not perhaps form a very prominent item on the receipt side of the school ledger; but something in aid of its expenses might be obtained, while (and this is of far more consequence) the requirement of the payment, and the steps taken to enforce it, would be a practical protest in favour of the great principle of parental responsibility, and would powerfully check that negligence of family ties and duties which the busy occupations and the crowded population of our large towns necessarily encourage.

We cannot pass from this portion of our subject without strongly recommending to the study of our readers Miss Carpenter's excellent work on 'Reformatory Schools,' which has reached us since the foregoing pages were written. It is the first book in which we have seen the difficult question she treats of adequately handled; the facts to be relied on justly stated; and (most important of all) the objections to be answered fairly acknowledged and intelligently met, if not thoroughly disposed of. The book embraces a wider field than our own remarks have been restricted to; the condition of the 'children of the perishing and dangerous classes,' and the complete educational provision required for them being her main subject. We have confined our view to the smaller, but more defined and tangible class of 'Juvenile Offenders;' believing that it is with these that a *practical beginning* must be made, and that a good system of correctional training, applied to the detected and convicted delinquent, will react most beneficially on the, as yet, unconvicted mass, of which they are now the corrupting examples. Miss Carpenter's chapter on the fundamental principles of Reformatory training, and on the management and mixed results of ragged schools, will repay an attentive and repeated perusal. As she is herself, an earnest and unwearied labourer in the work, she speaks with authority and gives us the results of a trustworthy experience. We cannot but wish that some of the able legal philanthropists whose views she quotes on the difficult and disputed points of enforcing the parents' responsibility, and depriving the depraved and worthless of the natural rights over their children, which they have forfeited by their misconduct,

would adopt the same practical spirit, and not only tell us that other laws are wanted, but would draw up in appropriate words the clauses of such an Act as would operate effectually for such a purpose. How to define the child's condition and the parents' offence so as to touch the guilty, and yet give no handle for vexatious interference, or malicious injury, is a more serious difficulty, than her chapter of 'objections answered' represents. The analogies of a parent's *madness* or *physical disease* are worth little: what we want is, a practical test which a policeman can apply, and a magistrate decide upon. For ourselves, we see but one effectual way of meeting the difficulty. Let it be obligatory on all parents to send their children to some description of school. Let the schools be regulated on efficient principles, giving superintendence and moral oversight, as well as mere instruction. Then let the child who is found habitually idling and gambling in the streets and alleys, be laid hold of, and his friends or legal guardians summoned to account for his neglected state; and wherever they are proved to be careless of his moral condition or desirous to corrupt it, let a fitting penalty be imposed upon them, and measures taken to prevent the child becoming a plague-spot on society.

Our paper has already exceeded our intended limits, else we had desired to have examined in some detail the means by which the system of detention and corrective education has been followed out in the countries where it has prevailed, and the results which have accompanied it: a few words, however, must suffice for this.\* The system has been most widely and systematically acted on in France, and it is satisfactory to its advocates to find that it has not only survived the late internal

---

\* The work of Messrs. De Lurieu and Romand, on les Colonies Agricoles de Mendiants, jeunes, détenus, &c., will furnish our readers with a full and intelligent account of the corrective and preventive institutions now existing in Holland, Belgium, and Switzerland. Our space forbids our making the extracts from it which we could wish.

The following remark has been verified in the experience of many of our English institutions:— 'La plupart des colonies agricoles commencent ainsi par des folles mises de fonds en acquisition de terrain, en constructions et en mobilier; c'est à dire qu'elles déposent dans les fondements mêmes de l'œuvre un germe de mort ou de ruine prochaine.' We trust that this great error will be effectually avoided in any general establishment of schools of correction in this country. It can be, if too much be not attempted at once, and if simplicity and practical efficiency be sought for, to the exclusion of mere mechanism and show.

changes and distractions by which French society has been afflicted, but has been more distinctly recognised and sanctioned by the representatives of the people since the revolution of 1848, than before.

Up to the year 1839, it should be noted the juvenile offender in France was the subject of *detention* without the indispensable additions of corrective *discipline* and *training*. He was committed to the great district prisons for periods varying from five to ten years, and was in fact the subject of a cruel though unintentional injustice, the prison being utterly unable to give the instruction or exert the moral influence which his age and circumstances needed, and to receive which the law sentenced him to detention in it. And while the adult offender suffered an imprisonment of twelve months, or two years, for much heavier crimes, and then left the prison free, to return to social life, the boy remained in the same prison, practically, a *captive* for a far longer period; often for a comparatively trifling delinquency. To this gross defect in the penal system of the country, a remedy was first applied in 1839 by Messrs. Demetz and De Courteilles, the founders of the correctional school of Mettray. Mettray was established for the express purpose of taking the boys thus unjustly, and against the proper aim and purpose of the law, consigned to a long and almost hopeless imprisonment as convicts, and placing them under such effective moral and industrial training, as might reform while it punished, and might prepare for the future while it enforced a penalty for the past.

Mettray will, we trust, be sufficiently known to our readers to render any particular notice of its system unnecessary. The leading ideas of all reformatory agency are thoroughly embodied in it; viz. moral influence and active manual occupation. The peculiarities of the institution are, the attempt to revive a *family* or *domestic feeling* by dividing the boys into *households*, and the introduction of field and garden labour as the chief source of industrial occupation. Of these elements the last may be said to have completely succeeded, and Mettray may justly claim the honour of having shown that out-door work is not incompatible with the discipline and regularity of correctional restraint. Of the other element, 'the family system,' considering that there is no female influence — no 'dames' or 'matrons' — that the 'pere' is a young unmarried man; that the meals, the levée, &c., are all done by military rule and signal, — we are disposed to consider that its real advantage lies in the distribution of the boys into smaller and manageable portions, and the greater personal and individual relation it establishes be-

tween them and their teachers. This is indeed a benefit hardly to be over-estimated. The authors of the *Etudes sur les Colonies Agricoles* say truly, 'Il est essentiel que le nombre des enfants réunis dans une même école rurale ne soit pas plus considérable que trente ou quarante afin qu'un seul maître suffise à les diriger, à les conduire, à les élever.' The opening of Mettray was soon followed by the establishment of Petit Bourg near Paris, in which children of the destitute and pauper class were received as well as jeunes détenus. The system of this institution is to associate the boys on the old and common system, training them however, as at Mettray, mainly in agriculture and gardening. On visiting it in 1849 we found about 150 boys mainly of the convict class. At that date schools similar to Mettray had been opened at Rouen, Marseilles, Amiens, &c., the Government paying for the maintenance of the children at the rate of 7*d.* per diem each, in addition to a contribution of 3*l.* per head for clothing. Modifications of the Mettray system had been also introduced into several of the large district prisons, as at Clairvaux, Loos, Gaillon, and Fontevault, at which latter place a farm of 150 acres was taken into cultivation—70 of the 300 young prisoners confined in the prison being employed on it, with most satisfactory results as to their conduct, and the utility and profit of their labour. On the whole, so great have been found to be the advantages of correctional training as thus associated with detention in France, that in 1850 the Assembly agreed to the recommendation of the Committee from whose report we have already quoted, and decreed the national adoption of the system, on a scale large enough to embrace the whole mass of Juvenile Delinquency which has to be dealt with. The *Projet du Loi* agreed to by them on this subject enacts, 1st. That in any preliminary stage of imprisonment the juveniles shall be wholly separated from the adults. 2ndly. All juvenile offenders sentenced to imprisonment for periods between six months and two years, and all such as are sentenced to detention as having acted sans discernement, shall be placed in *colonies pénitenciaires*, there to be brought up under strict rules of discipline, and employed in husbandry and its associated employments. 3rdly. That private associations shall be encouraged to form these *colonies pénitenciaires*, the State assisting and co-operating as at Mettray, and that if an adequate number are not established in two years, the Government shall interpose, and found as many as are needed at the national cost. 4thly. That *penal colonies* shall be established in Algeria for young offenders sentenced to more than two years' imprisonment, and for those who, after

being admitted into the reformatory school, prove themselves unworthy of its advantages. Mons. Demetz informs us that the number of reformatory institutions, now in France in execution of this law, is forty-two, containing near three thousand children.

Such is the state of the question of Juvenile Delinquency in France. Within the last two years a great establishment for the corrective training of juvenile offenders has been formed in Belgium, at Rhusyllede near Ghent. This institution is principally for children convicted of vagrancy and begging, and is remarkable as being founded by the Government alone, without the aid of private benevolence. An extensive and disused sugar refinery, with above 300 acres of good average land attached, was purchased for about 6500*l*. The buildings of the manufactory, with some necessary alterations, will afford accommodation for 500 boys; 120 are already admitted. The requisite farm buildings, &c. are in progress. A school for 200 girls, and another for the more infantine portion of the vagrant and destitute classes, are to be erected in connexion with it, but at some miles distance.

We cannot but regret that the old collective method of discipline and management is to be resorted to at Rhusyllede, the whole mass of boys being associated, and their dormitories (four in number) being fitted up to contain 125 beds in each. When large numbers of lads are thus brought together, there may be good discipline, and, with very competent teachers, good instruction; — but moral and religious influence cannot be looked for. That the boys are to be mainly brought up to husbandry and gardening is an important alleviation of the evil; these occupations naturally scattering and dividing them; but we cannot but think the *immediate economical* gain of the collective method would have been much more than compensated for by the *ultimate moral* gain of the family or distributive system. The remarks, however, of Messrs. De Lurieu and Romand, that the Belgian boys are '*plus faciles à manier, moins bruyants, moins turbulents,*' than French lads; that their dispositions are '*aussi calmes et aussi soumis*' as to require only one officer for sixty boys, may explain how Mons. Ducpetiaux has felt justified in abandoning, on this point, the Mettray model.

On other points, Rhusyllede affords a very useful pattern for our study. The boys have from two to three hours' instruction, their mental training being limited to reading, writing, arithmetic, mental calculation, with some history and geography, and as much agricultural information as can be imparted. Music and gymnastics form part of their recreations.

One feature of its system we should be disposed to introduce into our English schools of correction, viz. that of a specially correctional ward, in which the boy may pass any term of preliminary separation which his case or character may make advisable. In this respect, Rhusyllde appears to have taken a hint from Parkhurst, whose probationary ward has always seemed to us one of its most useful portions.\* We should desire to see this feature introduced into our juvenile schools of correction in England. A strictly correctional ward or division, into which each new inmate should be received, and in which the more confirmed and ill-disposed should be retained for a sufficient period, to allow of reformatory influence being fully brought to bear on them, would be very advantageous. It should be attached to each school, under the same general superintendence, but with special regulations as to the diet, labour, silence, and separation of its inmates

The agricultural colonies in Switzerland were in 1849 thirty-two in number, chiefly founded by Wehrli. In these, however, as in many of the similar institutions, now opened in France, orphans and enfans trouvés are mingled with the vagrant and the beggar. None of them contain more than forty, and most only thirty children.†

It is strong evidence in favour of the reformatory system for young offenders, that our transatlantic brethren have taken it up. The Report of the Prison Discipline Society for 1850 shows that schools of reform, such as our remarks have contemplated, are now being generally founded, at the charge of the different local governments, for the proper training and correction of the juvenile offenders of the United States, and these too, generally on the principle of *agricultural* occupation as the main source of employment. Thus Maine, Massachusetts, Connecticut, New York, have each of them *farm schools*; while houses of refuge, affording more sedentary employments

---

\* We cannot think that Miss Carpenter has done full justice to Parkhurst prison as now constituted. The last two years have seen very important improvements in its system. There is more industry and labour, less of the pèdantry of discipline, and a more practical style of school instruction.

† It should be added, that an institution with similar objects is being formed at Rysselt, near Zutphen, in Holland, where, mainly by the contributions of some benevolent individuals, 130 acres of land have been purchased, and the requisite buildings put in course of erection. It is to be called 'The Dutch Mettray.' The children will be divided into families of twelve only, in imitation of M. Wichern's admirable Rauhe Haus at Hamburg.

to their young inmates, are found in Rhode Island, at Cincinnati, Baltimore, Philadelphia, &c. The juvenile delinquent, we should remark, is usually committed for detention in these schools, till the expiration of his minority; the trustees of the school having discretion to apprentice the boy out at such times as they shall think fit, and having, both before and after the apprenticeship, the legal powers of parents and guardians. At Westborough, Massachusetts; out of 334 admitted, 247 were sentenced till of age; 5 till 20; 1 for 10 years; 2 for 8; 5 for 6 years, &c. The offences for which these boys are thus placed under reformatory discipline in America are worthy of remark. At Westborough there were committed for larceny, 119; *stubbornness*, 110; idle and disorderly conduct, 20; vagrancy, 23; shop breaking and stealing, 17; house breaking, 4; pilfering, 5; having obscene books for circulation, 2; common drunkards, 2, &c. It is added that of the whole number, 66 were foreigners and 268 born in the United States, but of the last, 96 were of Irish, 3 of English, and 1 of German parents. It will be admitted that the American public know the value of the dollar, and are not likely to throw away their resources on visionary and unproductive schemes of mere vague benevolence. The circumstance, therefore, that they are thus adopting the detentive and corrective method of treating juvenile offenders must be allowed to be a strong recommendation in its favour to the practical economist.

We cannot but hope that the day is not far distant when the same principle will be brought into practical operation in our own country, and the School of Correction be looked upon as a necessary provision for the lighter and more numerous classes of juvenile delinquencies, as Parkhurst is in cases of a heavier and rarer description. To these, gradually and quietly introduced, simply organised, and strictly regulated, we principally look for the mitigation of the serious mischiefs which youthful crime is entailing upon society; and to the establishment of these we would invite the co-operation equally of the philanthropist and the statesman, (if we must still distinguish between the two,) — believing that, aided by such checks upon the parents and the parish as we have spoken of, a general and consistent system of corrective and reformatory discipline would rescue thousands of children from destruction, would relieve the community from a heavy and wasteful expense, and would make the due execution of our penal laws more effective and more just.



ART. V.—*Correspondance entre Le Comte de Mirabeau et Le Comte De La March, pendant les années 1789, 1790 et 1791. Recueillie, mise en ordre, et publiée, par M. AD. De BACOURT, Ancien Ambassadeur de France près la Cour de Sardaigne.*

THE Revolution in France of 1848 has revived our interest in the causes and consequences of the greater Revolution of 1789, and in the conduct and character of the persons who took prominent parts in the transactions of that most eventful period of modern history.

There are undoubtedly great differences in the Revolutions of 1789 and 1848, but they are by no means destitute of resemblance. The chief point of similitude is, that at both periods the political and social organisation of France was broken up into its component elements; in the Revolution of 1789, perhaps with inevitable precipitancy, in that of 1848, in a spirit of unnecessary change, and with reckless conceit. On both occasions the Monarchical form of government was overthrown, after a desperate struggle in 1789, and without resistance in 1848. In truth the old and corrupt monarchy which fell with Louis XVI. had more blood in its veins, and died harder than the recently embodied royalty of Louis Philippe. The foundations of the former had been deeply laid in the traditions and habits, if not in the affections, of the people; while the latter had but a slight hold on the surface, and yielded to the first puff of the revolutionary tempest.

So many political problems had been solved between 1789 and 1848, and so many results had been obtained favourable to the best interests of society, and to the rights of the people, that at the latter period, there was little more to do in the way of organic improvement, than to extend the electoral franchise, so as to make the elected body a real representation of the French people. A reform of Parliament was required, and not a change in the form of the government itself. Louis Philippe, by obstinately resisting the first, was the principal agent in bringing about the latter. It cannot be said that he was ill-advised, for, though his Ministers agreed with him, he was his own counsellor; he had not, like Louis XVI., a family to influence him, or courtiers to mislead him; he himself was convinced that the French people possessed as much liberty and political power as could be safely entrusted to them, and he would not even entertain the question of further extension. In this respect Louis XVI. appears to comparative advantage:

he felt that great administrative changes were required, and he was ready, *salvâ regis dignitate*, to make them. His task, even if he had been honestly and respectfully supported by the National Assembly, and well counselled by his Ministers, would have been most difficult; nor was that of the National Assembly itself less so. Master spirits were required at once on the throne and in the Assembly. The reigning Bourbon was altogether unfitted for the exigencies of the occasion. A master spirit did appear in the Assembly, but under such unfavourable circumstances, and for so short a time, that the benefits to have been derived from the commanding influence of a man, uniting in himself the opposite qualifications of a tribune of the people, and of a minister of the Sovereign, remain the object of mere speculation, and do not belong to the records of history.—That man was Mirabeau.

Mirabeau's youthful immoralities had exceeded the license permitted to his age and station, so that, the first time he appeared in the hall of the States-General he was received with murmurs of disapprobation. Nor was this surprising; he stood there a convicted adulterer, and a betrayer of official confidence.\* He is reported to have met this reception with a smile of disdain; feeling, as he must have done, an irresistible conviction, that his success in the career just opened to him would soon cause the vices of his private life to be overlooked. We may also add a belief that the consciousness of the public good, which he felt himself capable of achieving, gave him an honourable confidence in his power of self-redemption.

The great question was immediately brought under discussion—‘Were the *Etats Généraux* to deliberate in one body or separately?’ The *Tiers Etat* contended for the first, while the orders of the Nobility and of the Clergy claimed the right of separate deliberation for each of the three Orders. Mirabeau, though a member of the *Tiers Etat*, was far from at once adopting their pretensions; and he applied, through Malonet, who was personally acquainted with some of the ministers, for an interview with Monsieur Necker. That interview took place, and we have the authority of Malonet, in his *Memoirs*, for the fact, that Mirabeau, after explaining his views regarding a constitutional monarchy, pressed upon Necker the importance

---

\* We allude to his adulterous connexion with Madame Monnier (Sophia Ruffey), and to the sale by him to a bookseller of the manuscript of the ‘*Secret History of the Court of Berlin*,’ which was in fact a publication of his official despatches to the Minister for Foreign Affairs, during his secret mission at Berlin.

of the Government overcoming the resistance of the orders of Nobility and Clergy to a union with the Tiers Etat, in order to avoid the evils which would inevitably follow from its continuance. Necker was cold and disdainful, and made no reply to the suggestion. Mirabeau left the minister in great irritation, and is reported to have said, 'Je ne reviendrai plus, mais il 'aura de mes nouvelles.' Malonet admits that from the opening of the *Etats Généraux* Mirabeau evinced a fixed determination to support the Royal authority, provided it were founded on constitutional principles; but from the first, also, he had a double character to sustain—he endeavoured to be at the same time the supporter of order and kingly government, as well as the eloquent tribune of the people, whose force rested on his personal popularity, and on that only.

Mirabeau was a party with Sieyes and others in persuading the Tiers Etat to assume the title of the National Assembly, and to give to its members that of Representatives of the French People—titles which were resumed in the Constitution of 1848. The occurrences at the meeting of the National Assembly held in the Tennis Court, when the usual hall of their sittings had been shut up, under pretence of repairs, are well known to our readers; and it may be truly said that, with the language of Mirabeau to the Marquis de Brézé, Grand Master of the Ceremonies, who had called upon the Three Orders to separate, in conformity with the commands of the King, given at the Royal Seance of the 23d June, 1789, the Revolution began, and was at once completed. We believe the following to be the most correct record of what Mirabeau said on that ever memorable occasion:—'Oui, Monsieur, nous avons entendu les intentions 'qu'on a suggerées au Roi: et vous qui ne sauriez être son 'Organe auprès de l'Assemblée Nationale; vous, qui n'avez ici 'ni place, ni voix, ni droit de parler; allez dire à votre 'Maître qui nous sommes ici par la volonté du peuple, et que 'nous 'n'en sortirons que par la force des bayonnettes.' No words can convey a more energetic and dignified assertion of the independence of the representative body, and they at once annihilated the pageants of absolute monarchy.

Here then begins that Constituent Assembly which in its origin and functions was in some measure the prototype to that of 1848. Although the Constitution framed by the Constituent Assembly in 1791 had little duration, the reputation of the Assembly itself, far from diminishing, has rather increased with the progress of time. Much of the framework of the present organisation of France was then prepared, and the principles of its internal administration were definitively laid down. We cannot but admire the great capacity and various talents dis-

played by the Members of that Assembly, brought more prominently forward by the contrasts of their political opinions. Mirabeau shone with greater brightness than any other individual, but he did not eclipse his distinguished colleagues. Barnave, Maury, Cazales were powerful rivals in eloquence, and the political metaphysician Sieyes scarcely yielded to Mirabeau in sagacious anticipations and energetic decision at critical moments.

The Members of the Committee appointed to prepare the Project of the Constitution by the Constituent Assembly were Talleyrand, Sieyes, Monnier, Chapelier, Lally Tolendal, Clermont Tonnerre, Champion de Cicé (Archbishop of Toulouse), and Bergasse. Let our readers compare these names with those of the Committee that framed the Constitution of 1848; Cormenin, Marrast, La Mennais, Vivien, Tocqueville, Dufaure, Martin (de Strasbourg), Woirhaye, Coquerel, Corbon, Thourret de l'Allier, Gustave de Beaumont, Dupin, Vaulabelle, O. Barrot, Pagès de l'Arriège, Dornès, Considérant. From these two Committees emanated the Constitutions of 1791 and 1848, and the Members are respectively responsible for their works. It is painful to see the names of men so eminent in the present day, attached to the concoction of that of 1848, which, before the ink was dry upon the Constitutional Act, some of them declared to be contradictory in its provisions, unsuited to the people, and impracticable in execution.

The papers which form the subject of the present Article, collected, arranged, and edited by Monsieur Bacourt with great care and impartiality, are divided into three parts. The first part from page 4. to page 173. of the first volume consists of notices by the Comte de la Marck himself on the principal personages of the Court of Louis XVI., and of a narrative compiled from other less complete notes left by him, giving a detailed account of his intercourse with Mirabeau, and explanatory of the correspondence. To this narrative the editor has added some very useful notes of his own. We are inclined to think that readers in general will consider this the most interesting part of the work. The second part contains the correspondence with Mirabeau from the 28th of December 1789 till the 24th of March 1791; he died on the 2nd of April of that year. This correspondence occupies a portion of the first volume, the whole of the second, and the first 113 pages of the third volume. In the last portion of the third volume the reader will find several letters from the Comte de la Marck to the Comte Mercy d'Argenteau and to other persons, together with a few notes drawn up by Monsieur Pellenc, Mirabeau's private secretary, after the death of Mirabeau.

The sketches of character and observations contained in the original notes of the Comte de la Marck are full of interest; and we regret that our limits restrict us to a few extracts, and to an abridgment of the narrative. We particularly recommend to our readers the Comte de la Marck's remarks on the relations of Marie Antoinette with the Duchesse de Polignac, and on the leading persons admitted to her intimate society.

The Comte de la Marck, describing Marie Antoinette, says:

'I will endeavour to bring together some notices of various circumstances, in which I was personally placed in a situation to become acquainted with the Queen, and to appreciate her character. She had, above all, great goodness of heart, and a strong inclination to oblige those who sought her good offices, and too often this kindness of disposition was imposed upon. Marie Antoinette did not possess much reach of mind, but she readily perceived and comprehended what was brought before her. The gaiety of her character gave her an inclination to jest, which she sometimes carried to the length of ridicule. This was a fault in a person placed in her station, and those around her were apt to encourage her in it. I can, without hesitation, assert that the Queen was not in the habit of exerting her influence with the King in the choice of his ministers: the only exception was the nomination of the Marquis de Segur to the Ministry of War. I will even go farther, and say, that the Queen, so far from having any taste or desire to meddle in public affairs, had a positive repugnance for doing so, probably arising from the usual levity of the female character.'

The Comte de la Marck supports this assertion by citing various instances in which measures were adopted without her knowledge in opposition to her opinions and wishes. At the same time, the irresolution of the King in the midst of the dangers with which they were surrounded, forced the Queen forward, in order to supply the deficiencies of her royal husband.

The Comte de la Marck saw much of La Fayette before the latter embarked in the war of American Independence, and he describes him as an awkward imitator in fashionable life of his brother-in-law, the Vicomte de Noailles. This spirit of imitation suggested to La Fayette the desire to join the American insurgents, which the Vicomte de Noailles had already asked permission to do. Monsieur Bacourt, the editor of the correspondence, gives an extract from the memoirs of La Fayette, in which the latter assigns much higher motives for his joining the American cause. There is nothing, however, contradictory in the two statements. Imitation may have first suggested the idea to La Fayette's mind, and the determination once taken, he may have worked himself up into enthusiasm.

Speaking of the Duke of Orleans (p. 81.), the Comte says:—

‘Equity and impartiality compel me, in finishing this imperfect sketch of the character of the Duke of Orleans, not to pass over in silence the good qualities which I have observed in him. He was most scrupulous in performing his promises, and he considered himself irrevocably engaged even by a word hastily uttered; he was extremely shy, but this is a fault generally connected with goodness of heart. The Duke of Orleans never so far overcame this timidity as to be able to speak in public. When at one of the sittings of the Parliament he had to read a paper containing a few remarks in opposition to the commands just delivered by the King, he stammered and was nearly inaudible. On a still more important occasion, when he had undertaken to read a short address, urging the majority of the Noblesse to join the Tiers Etat, he fainted, and the windows were thrown open to revive him.’

The introduction of the Comte de la Marck to Mirabeau was effected at the desire of the Comte, through Monsieur Senné de Meilhan, ex-Intendant of the province of Hainault; and the occasion was a dinner at the house of the Prince de Poix, Governor of Versailles. The party consisted, besides, of the Comte and Comtesse de Tessé, Monsieur de Thun, and the Vicomte de Noailles, who had all expressed a wish to become acquainted with Mirabeau. The following are the Comte de la Marck’s first impressions of his future intimate friend. (P. 81.)

‘He was tall, squarely and heavily built; his head, large beyond the usual proportions, was further increased by a large quantity of hair, curled and powdered; he wore a plain coat, with buttons of enormous dimensions of coloured stones; his whole dress was an exaggeration of the fashion, and very unlike that of the Court. His features were disfigured by the small-pox, he had a downward look, but his eyes were full of fire. Meaning to be polite, he exaggerated his salutations, and his first words were absurd compliments sufficiently vulgar. In short, he had neither the manners nor the language of the society in which he then happened to be; and although by his birth he was equal in rank to his hosts, it was quite evident he was entirely deficient in the ease of manners that belongs to good society. It was not till Monsieur de Meilhan turned the conversation to general politics and administration, that every thing ridiculous and vulgarly affected in Mirabeau’s manner and conversation disappeared. All then remarked the abundance and clearness of his ideas, and he enchanted his hearers by his brilliant and energetic manner of expressing them.’

The Comte de la Marck relates the following anecdote in connexion with this dinner:—‘The Prince de Poix, who read but a little, and was not at all *au fait* of public affairs, having said,

‘on Monsieur Necker’s name being mentioned, “*Ah! there, indeed, is a man!*” Mirabeau, surprised by this burst of eulogy, drew back a few steps, and, bowing with great gravity to the Prince, replied, “Yes, he is a great player at cup and ball.”’

The result of this first meeting was a mutual expression of a wish, by the Comte de la Marck and Mirabeau, to continue the acquaintance. The Duke of Orleans, on finding that the Comte de la Marck was in habits of intercourse with Mirabeau, intimated a desire to become acquainted with him, and they met at dinner at the Comte’s. Mirabeau was not pleased with the Duke, who, he remarked, did not inspire him with any confidence.

The Comte de la Marck being elected a Deputy of the Noblesse for the Bailliage of Quesnoy, in which the estate of Raismes, which he possessed in right of his wife, was situated, was present at the opening of the *Etats Généraux*; and he and Mirabeau met in the Assembly three days after the union of the Three Orders. The Comte de la Marck had adhered to the measures of the majority of the Order to which he belonged. Mirabeau went up to him, and said, ‘Ne reconaissez vous plus vos anciens amis; vous ne m’avez encore rien dit?’ The Comte proposed their dining together, which was accepted by Mirabeau. On that occasion Mirabeau said, ‘You are no doubt dissatisfied with me.’ ‘And with many others,’ was the reply. ‘If that be so, you ought to be dissatisfied with the inhabitants of the Chateau.—*Le vaisseau de l’état est battu par la plus violente tempête, et il n’y a personne à la barre.*’ These words are remarkable, for they contain the formula of all Mirabeau’s subsequent communications with the Court and the Ministers. Mirabeau felt even at that early period that he was wanted at the helm. We would willingly transcribe the whole of this conversation between the Comte de la Marck, for in it Mirabeau briefly but completely developed his views respecting the future government of France. ‘The fate of France,’ he said, ‘was decided. The words Liberty and Taxes voted by the people, had been uttered throughout the kingdom, and there is no issue out of the difficulty, but by a Constitution, more or less similar to that of England: the day on which the Ministers of the King will agree to discuss the state of affairs with me, they will find me devoted to the Royal cause, and to that of Constitutional Monarchy.’ This sentiment was at the bottom of all his plans and opinions until the day of his death. The conversation took place at the end of the month of June 1789.

The Comte de la Marck, in his intimate intercourse with Mirabeau, became convinced that it would not be difficult to secure his parliamentary support of the royal cause, as his principles were sincerely monarchical. The Comte opened himself on the subject to Monsieur de Cillé, Archbishop of Bordeaux, and Keeper of the Seals; the latter was ready to adopt the Count's views, but declared that Monsieur Necker could never consent to any such proposition. The violent language too often held by Mirabeau in the Assembly, and in the Revolutionary Societies, drew from the Comte de la Marck a very strong remonstrance, which was well and patiently received; but Mirabeau said in his defence that 'it was impossible for him 'to act otherwise, without risking the loss of his popularity, 'which was his strength.' 'The armies,' said he, 'are in face 'of each other, negotiation or conflict must take place. The 'Government will adopt neither, and is playing a very dangerous game.'

Droz, in his History of the Reign of Louis XVI., asserts that Mirabeau, about this time, received a sum of 300,000 francs through Le Clos, from the Duke of Orleans, to purchase his services in the Assembly. This accusation, so often brought against Mirabeau, is utterly denied by the Comte de la Marck, who truly says, that it was very unlikely that, if Mirabeau had just received so large a sum from the Duke of Orleans, he should have applied to him for a loan of 50 louis, which he did the same month. Even Droz admits that Mirabeau would not have taken money on condition of acting contrary to his principles; and La Marck emphatically says, 'Non, jamais Mirabeau 'ne sacrifia ses principes à ses intérêts pécuniaires.' Mirabeau's own expression regarding the Duke of Orleans was, 'On prétend que je suis de son parti; je ne voudrais pas de lui pour 'mon valet.' However, Mirabeau's language to the Comte de Narbonne, recorded by Droz, might lead to a less favourable conclusion. 'Un homme comme moi peut recevoir cent mille 'écus, mais on n'a pas un homme comme moi pour cent mille 'écus.' A distinction almost as dangerous as that attributed to Bacon, between selling justice, but not injustice.

The Comte de la Marck, anxious to explain to the Queen the reasons of his intimacy with Mirabeau, employed the Comtesse d'Ossun, the Dame d'Atours (p. 99.) to convey to Her Majesty that his object was to moderate Mirabeau's revolutionary outbreaks, and to make him useful to the King, in concert with the Ministers. The Queen granted the Comte an audience, at which, while she admitted his good intentions, she added, 'Nous 'ne serons jamais assez malheureux, je pense, pour être réduits



'à la pénible extrémité de recourir à Mirabeau.' The Queen had afterwards recourse to the services of Mirabeau, but the reluctance with which she did so, prevented her from ever giving him her entire confidence. The Comte was much disappointed at this failure, for daily intercourse had increased his own confidence in him, and had brought conviction to his mind that the formidable tribune possessed estimable qualities of head and heart. Mirabeau on one occasion, full of repentance for the past, exclaimed, in a tone of deep affliction, 'Ah! que l'immoralité de ma jeunesse fait de tort à la chose publique!' Memorable words, containing a practical lesson to public men, that the highest talents will be deprived of their natural influence by reckless disregard of morality.

The sagacity of Mirabeau led him to anticipate some catastrophe, such as took place on the 5th and 6th October; for some days before he said to La Mark, 'Tout est perdu! le Roi et la Reine y périront, et vous le verrez; la populace battra leur cadavres.' The events of the 5th and 6th October were the beginning of the accomplishment of this terrific prophecy. The Comte gives a short account of the occurrences of the 5th and 6th October, of which he was an eye-witness, not very favourable to Monsieur La Fayette, and quite exculpating Mirabeau from having any connexion with the movement of the populace of Paris upon Versailles.

The day after the King was dragged, as Comte de la Mark very justly expresses it, to the Tuilleries, Mirabeau urged him to press upon the King and Queen the necessity of leaving Paris; otherwise that 'they and France were lost.' He further asked the Count, if he were in a position to give their Majesties an assurance that they might rely upon him. A few days afterwards Mirabeau placed in the Count's hand a memoir on the subject, dated the 5th of October, 1789. This memoir is found in the 'Correspondance.' Mirabeau, while he recommended the King and Royal Family to quit Paris and to go to Normandy, deprecated any intention of leaving France, which he characterised as an irreparable act of imprudence. The King's total want of energy prevented the adoption of this plan, which, if carried out at that time with all the concomitant measures recommended by Mirabeau, might perhaps have arrested the progress of the Revolution.

Mirabeau had personally a very low opinion of La Fayette's abilities, and great distrust of his political conduct; still he felt the importance to the royal cause of their acting together, and made advances to La Fayette for that purpose. They were unsuccessful; for Monsieur La Fayette, neither then nor at any

period of his political life, had quite made up his mind as to what was best to be done for the public interest, or indeed for his own. Whereas Mirabeau was decision personified. He sought the establishment of a Limited Monarchy for France, and the position of Prime Minister for himself. La Fayette had probably at this time some vague notion of a Monarchy with Republican institutions, of which he meant himself to be the Protector; but he never dreamt of giving to the Sovereign the degree of independent authority which is absolutely necessary for the efficiency of the Executive Power. This vague and contradictory notion of a Republican Monarchy seemed about to become a reality in 1830, but was dissipated by the dexterity and determination of Louis Philippe. La Fayette had not changed — he still had more vanity than ambition, but had not perspicacity nor resolution sufficient to save his vanity from mystification, nor to work out for himself the place which would have satisfied his ambition. His probity obtained for him the confidence of Louis XVI.; but he was an impracticable counsellor for a King; on the contrary, Mirabeau had no object of personal ambition which was not compatible with the vigorous exercise of the royal authority within constitutional limits; indeed his personal success depended upon that very condition. In this view of the comparative utility of the two men to the royal cause, the immorality and pecuniary embarrassments of Mirabeau were a very subordinate consideration; and yet with Louis XVI. they outweighed all others.

If Mirabeau held La Fayette cheap as a statesman, La Fayette did not set a very high value on the parliamentary services of Mirabeau; for he rather insidiously proposed to him a sum of 50,000 francs from the king's civil list (of which he disposed), and an embassy that might eventually lead to a ministry. Mirabeau rejected these offers, feeling himself to be the only man who could save the entire political fabric from falling to pieces. When Necker retired from the Ministry, if it had not been for the decree of the 7th November, 1789, which excluded the King's Ministers from seats in the Assembly, Mirabeau might possibly have been placed in a position which would have enabled him, as Minister, to make head against the revolutionary storm; but that fatal decree of exclusion disqualified him for all public authority in the direction of affairs, and limited his services to private counsels, which, however, were only given to be neglected.

The Comte de la Marck left Paris on the 15th of December, 1789, and did not return till the 15th of March, 1790. During his absence from Paris he corresponded with Mirabeau, and

was so dissatisfied with the course taken by him in the Assembly — violent, and very contrary to the opinions expressed by him in private, that their intimate communications, at least on political affairs, would probably have ceased, if the Comte de Mercy, the Austrian ambassador, had not, at the command of the King and Queen, given to the intercourse with Mirabeau a more positive character than it had hitherto possessed. An interview took place between Mirabeau and the Comte de Mercy, at which Mirabeau again urged the necessity of the King quitting Paris, but not the kingdom. They parted well satisfied with each other: the Comte de Mercy was convinced that Mirabeau was able to render most important services to the cause of Royalty, and thought that no further time ought to be lost in securing them.

The reluctance of their Majesties to come into direct intercourse with a man of so bad a private character, and who had done so much in the first instance to bring on the Revolution, is apparent throughout, and it was clear that although employed, he was not trusted. The King was ashamed of the intercourse, and enjoined the strictest secrecy on the subject. Meantime, he paid Mirabeau's debts, amounting to 208,000 francs; and a million of francs in bank notes were placed in the Comte de la Marck's hands to be given to Mirabeau at the end of the session, if the King was satisfied with his services. He was to receive besides a monthly allowance of 6000 francs. The bank notes were returned by the Comte to the King after the death of Mirabeau.

On the 3rd of July, 1790, the Queen, at the suggestion of the Comte de Mercy, admitted Mirabeau to a personal conference at the Palace of St. Cloud, where the Court then was. The Queen, as she told the Comte de la Marck a few days after this interview, became satisfied of the sincere attachment of Mirabeau to the Monarchy and to the persons of their Majesties. Mirabeau, as might have been expected from the feelings or prejudices of his caste, in which he largely participated, was charmed with the personal grace and affable manners of Marie Antoinette. His solicitude to repair the injuries that he had done was increased, and his expression to the Comte de la Marck was, '*rien ne m'arrêtera: je périrai plutôt que de manquer à mes principes.*' (P. 190.) The Comte de la Marck tells us that he believed the King and Queen had as much confidence in himself, *as it was possible* for them to have in any one, but that in truth they gave their confidence to no one. A most unfortunate withholding, for it produced uncertainty and vacillation.

The Comte de Mercy was at this time called to other duties

by the Emperor Joseph, and the Comte de La Marck himself had, in September, 1790, intended to give up his seat in the Assembly, and to leave Paris, but was induced by the Comte de Mercy to abandon the intention, and to enter into correspondence with him during his temporary absence. As the King could not be persuaded to change his Ministers, and as it was indispensable to make some one of them privy to the intercourse between Mirabeau and the Court, the Comte de Montmorin was, on the advice of the Comte de Mercy, selected for the purpose, and from henceforth took part in the confidential communications between the parties.

Mirabeau, encouraged by the direct coalition between him and the Comte de Montmorin, the only one of the last Ministry who had remained in office, drew up a Memoir, which is found in the Correspondence under the date of the 23d December, 1790, entitled, 'View of the State of France, and of the Means of reconciling Public Liberty with the Royal Authority.' This Memoir was given by the Comte de la Marck to the Queen, who was much struck with it, and especially with that part which pointed out the personal danger of the Royal Family: not so the King, who, whether, as the Comte says, from resignation even to such a fate as that of Charles the First, or from apathy, could not be roused to any vigorous resolution by the first perusal of the Memoir.

Mirabeau's parliamentary career now drew to a close. We will not attempt to abridge the account of his last illness and death, but refer our readers to the work itself for the interesting details. His bodily sufferings, which he bore with fortitude, were very great, and he expired in the arms of the Comte, at half-past eight o'clock on the morning of the 2nd of April, 1791. The Comte thus concludes the account of the last hours of Mirabeau: 'I have already said, one must have known him in intimacy to do justice to his great and noble qualities, and to understand how great was his power of attraction. Notwithstanding the differences of character which existed between us, I know not how to express the irresistible charm which drew me towards him — it was a charm which he exercised on all who knew him intimately. Those who were united to him by ties of affection, cherished the most tender recollection of him.'

Three days before his death, and when there was no hope of his recovering, he himself proposed to La Marck to take charge of his papers, in which, he said, there was much to compromise different individuals, and to enable ill-disposed persons to mislead public opinion; he at the same time called upon the Comte to promise that they should be, at a fitting time, pub-

lished in vindication of his memory. The Comte readily gave the promise required; and, assisted by Monsieur Pellenc, Mirabeau's private secretary, after destroying, in a very hurried manner, some papers which the Comte admits were of importance, made a selection which forms the correspondence which is now before us.

The Comte de la Marck says, that Mirabeau, although possessed of great quickness of perception, vigour of thought, and felicity of expression in conversation, and in the tribune, was very slow in written composition, that he found great difficulty in expressing his ideas, and that he added and erased so much, as to render his manuscripts illegible. This was undoubtedly the reason that he so constantly employed others, and particularly Dumont and Pellenc to prepare notes, and even complete memoirs, which formed the substance of his more elaborate speeches; but these documents were comparatively inanimate bodies, until vivified and set in motion by the eloquent genius of Mirabeau. La Marck enumerates most of the persons thus employed by him.

Within a fortnight of the death of Mirabeau, the King, after having been prevented by the populace from going to St. Cloud, and being thereby literally confined to the Tuileries, determined to escape from Paris, in execution of a plan framed by Monsieur de Breteuil; Montmedy was the place to which the King and Royal Family were to have gone, but they were stopped at Varennes, and brought back to Paris. The Comte de La Marck saw the King and Queen frequently after their return, and rendered to them such trifling services as were in his power. After the acceptance of the Constitution by the King, in September, 1791, and the termination of the cabals of the Constitutional Assembly, the Comte thought the time had come when he might with propriety quit France; and accordingly he left Paris in the beginning of October, 1791. On going away, he made arrangements to continue his correspondence, whenever practicable, with the Comte de Montmorin, and he received several letters from him, published in the 'Correspondence.' The letters, from precaution, were forwarded in the hand-writing of the Comte de Montmorin's daughter, the Comtesse de Beaumont, to whom the secret of the correspondence was entrusted.

Before we enter upon an examination of the correspondence of Mirabeau with the Comte de La Marck, we must call the reader's attention to the letter of Marie Antoinette to Comte de Mercy, dated August 16. 1791, and republished in a note by M. de Hacourt, from the 'Retrospective Review.'

The unfortunate Queen began this remarkable letter on the

16th of August, but did not finish it till the 26th. The principal topics are, the acceptance of the Constitution by the King, the conduct of the emigrant Princes and Nobles, and the intervention of Foreign Powers in restoring the King's legitimate authority.

The Queen expresses her conviction that the King had no alternative, in accepting the Constitution which was about to be presented. Her Majesty had the same opinion of the Constitution of 1791 as the majority of those who voted for it, had of that of 1848. She thought it so full of defects and contradictions, that it could not work, and must necessarily fall under the general reprobation of the people. The King, she writes, should, in accepting it, refer to his declaration of the 29th of June, and maintain his opinion as to the impossibility of governing well with such a Constitution. When once accepted, the King should rigidly adhere to it, because his so doing would accelerate the expression of universal disgust. He ought '*marcher in quelque sorte toujours la loi à la main.*' Is not this counsel well adapted, *mutatis mutandis*, to the position of the present executive power in France towards the Constitution of 1848? She adds that, to succeed in this line of conduct, a ministry must be formed, composed of able and devoted men, ready to be disowned by the courtiers and aristocrats, who, however indignant, could never, at least by their own exertions, recover the position which they had lost.

The Queen, in the first part of her letter, utterly rejects the advice of the Princes to refuse acceptance of the Constitution, and to rely entirely upon the assistance of Foreign Powers. She criticises the conduct of each of those Powers, points out the indifference of the Emperor; the insidious policy of England, directed to the encouragement of all parties for the purpose of weakening all; and the steady selfishness of Prussia. Even union among these Powers would come too late to save the King from the immediate danger of refusing his acceptance. Still she thinks that much good might be done by a manifesto from all the coalesced Powers, as it might induce the leaders of parties in the Assembly to come into terms of accommodation. Great dissatisfaction is expressed at the conduct of the Princes, and of Monsieur Calonne, their principal adviser; and great bitterness at the report that the Allied Powers entertain a notion of acknowledging Monsieur regent of the kingdom, and the Comte d'Artois lieutenant-general. She treats the project as absurd, and ascribes the notion of it '*à quelque tête Française.*' This was her opinion on public affairs, but she 'doubted whether it would be followed, for the Comte knew

'the character of the person (meaning the King) with whom she had to deal, who, even at the moment when she might have supposed him to be convinced, would be changed by a single word or a single argument, without her being able to perceive that the alteration had taken place. This was the reason why many useful things could not be undertaken.' Marie Antoinette concludes this part by saying, that the Count may be assured that although 'she may be compelled to yield to circumstances, she will never consent to any act that is unworthy of her, *c'est dans le malheur qu'on sent d'avantage ce qu'on est.*' A sentiment well befitting the daughter of Maria Theresa.

In the last postscript to this letter the Queen gives up all expectation of personal freedom, under the continued degradation of the royal authority by the National Assembly, and owns that no resource was left, but to lull the enemies of royalty into a false security by feigned submission; with this feeling she has no hope now but from the assistance of Foreign Powers. The letter ends by an entreaty to the Emperor that he would put himself at the head of the coalition, and bring the united forces to their help. On him alone, she says, depended the happiness and the very existence of the King, of herself, of her children. She insists, that in giving this indispensable aid, the French Princes, and all the emigrant French, but especially the former, should be kept in the background, and not be allowed to show themselves.

We have devoted some space to the contents of this letter, as it may not be known to the generality of our readers, and because we ourselves think that it far exceeds in interest any letter in the 'Mirabeau and La Marck Correspondance.' On reading it, it is difficult not to come to the conclusion that if Marie Antoinette had been sovereign, either royalty would not have perished in her hands, or she would have died in the field, and not on the scaffold. Too much compassion cannot be bestowed on Louis XVI., but that compassion is not free from reproach; for his irresolution at critical moments actually accelerated, if it did not produce, that political and social convulsion, in which the throne, the altar, and the whole frame of civilised society in France, became one common ruin.

The first letter in the series is one from Mirabeau dated 28th December, 1788, to the Comte de Montmorin, then Minister for Foreign Affairs, and is remarkable as containing the first expression of Mirabeau's scheme for meeting the political and financial difficulties of the time, by establishing a constitution which might preserve the country from the 'plots of

‘ the aristocracy, the excesses of the democracy, and the complete  
‘ anarchy in which the royal authority itself, by aiming at being  
‘ absolute, was placed.’

The publication of the ‘ Secret History of the Court of  
‘ Berlin ’ had evidently taken place in the interval between this  
letter and one from Monsieur de Montmorin, dated 26th Feb.,  
1789. The minister’s letter was cold and guarded, as might  
well be expected, after such an occurrence. Mirabeau’s answer  
is more remarkable for shameless audacity than for ingenuity.  
We must confess our surprise that the editor, in a note upon  
these letters, should attempt to excuse Mirabeau for the breach  
of trust committed by him in publishing the work in question;  
Mirabeau’s story to Talleyrand, that the wife of a bookseller,  
who was his mistress, had abstracted the manuscript, and sold  
it to pay her husband’s debts, did not satisfy the then Bishop of  
Autun, nor does it us; for even if the story be true, the breach  
of trust receives no palliation.

The correspondence between the Comte de La Marck and  
Mirabeau begins with a very short note full of friendship and  
confidence, and proposing an interview. From the expression  
‘ ils ne font rien et viennent ici ce soir,’ it is evident that the  
Comte was already in communication with a knot of persons  
enjoying the confidence of the King, and employed in forming  
a party in the National Assembly, sufficiently numerous  
to control the extreme Democrats. Talon, the Procureur du  
Chatelet, and Monsieur Semonville, were two of the most active  
agents in this project. Mirabeau, who had played so much the  
part of an extreme democrat at the opening of the États Gé-  
néraux, was not taken into their counsels at first; but the  
Comte brought Talon and him into communication in the  
month of October, 1789. La Fayette, notwithstanding the  
events of the 5th and 6th of October, seems at this time to  
have possessed much of the King’s confidence; and, in fact, the  
clique pretended to do nothing without consulting him. He  
and Mirabeau were therefore necessarily brought to concert  
measures together; and La Fayette, as representing the wishes  
of the King, discussed with Mirabeau himself, and with the  
Comte de La Marck, the pecuniary assistance and official posi-  
tion which were to be the recompense of Mirabeau’s exertions.  
The correspondence during the month of October is chiefly  
directed to this point; we must, however, except the memoir  
drawn up by Mirabeau, and put into the hands of Monsieur,  
the brother of the King, by La Marck.

This memorandum, dated the 15th of October, recommended  
(p. 364.) that the King should with all publicity leave Paris,



where he was no longer a free agent, and fix himself at Rouen, and that he should call upon the Assembly to accompany him. Mirabeau discusses at some length the question of the time when this part of the plan should be carried into execution, and he decides that it should be so without delay. He recommends that successive proclamations should be issued by the King, explaining to the people their real interests, and that arrangements should be come to with the public creditors through agents duly appointed by them. There is nothing in this memoir, except the departure of the King from Paris, which is of importance; that measure was however capital, for upon it rested the personal freedom of the King, and the independent action of the executive authority.

The negotiation with La Fayette for pecuniary assistance and official employment came to nothing, and there is a letter from Mirabeau to La Fayette, dated 1st December, 1789, full of reproach and bitterness which, for the time at least, broke off all intimacy. (P. 433.) In this letter Mirabeau does not hesitate to tell La Fayette, 'that the intellectual giddiness produced by his position, and the indecision of his character, made him blind to the impossibility of maintaining a state of things, that nothing but success could justify. How often have I told you, while doing ample justice to your good qualities, that your liking for inferior men, and your miserable weakness for your own fancies, would destroy the noblest prospect, compromise yourself, and the public interests also.'

La Fayette had, we conclude, affronted Mirabeau, by attending to some scandalous reports which were in circulation about him: whatever these were, Mirabeau treats them with contempt, and even presses La Fayette to be more explicit. He avows that he has many debts, though not in the aggregate of a large amount,—'I have many debts, and this is the best answer that circumstances can make to the gossip of slanderers; but there is not an action of my life, even among my errors, which I cannot justify in a manner to make my enemies die of shame, if they had any.' Mirabeau had certainly a very loose notion of moral accountability.—The conclusion of this letter is sufficiently menacing. 'Believe me, Monsieur le Marquis, that I am not to be staid by this behaviour. My race is not run, for I am rather bored than tired, I am rather discouraged than hurt, and if the means of moving are refused me, I will answer by going on.'

In this page (p. 427.) commences a letter from the Marquise de Saillant, Mirabeau's sister, to his wife the Comtesse de Mirabeau, who seems to have written to the Marquise a letter ex-

pressing great anxiety on the subject of Mirabeau's political conduct and intentions. The Marquise gives in her letter Mirabeau's reply to his wife's inquiries on these points. As this letter contains Mirabeau's statement of his feelings and views, written in all the freedom of family intercourse, more complete credit may be given to the truth of its language, than even to the correspondence with La Marck; and certainly there is no discrepancy to be traced between the one and the other.

'The Comtesse de Mirabeau errs in supposing him ambitious in the vulgar acceptation of the term. He does not covet office, decorations, or dignities; but he has tried to prepare, to accelerate, and to establish a great revolution in human affairs, for the benefit of mankind. I have, assisted by the spirit of the age and unhopcd-for circumstances, succeeded up to a certain point, indeed more than an ordinary mortal could have expected, against whom his own faults and those of others had raised so many obstacles.

'The ignorance and the perfidy of the Government, and the unskillfulness of the party hostile to the Revolution on the other hand, have pushed me more than once further than I intended, but I have never deserted my principle, which is to return to, or to remain in, the *Juste Milieu*. What remains to be done? To give life to the Executive Power, to regenerate the Royal authority, and to reconcile it with national liberty—but all this cannot be done without a new Ministry, and the enterprise is sufficiently noble and dignified to make me wish to belong to it.

'No good ministry can be formed while the King's ministers are excluded from the legislature—the decree on that subject must be reversed, or the Revolution (we presume from Absolute to Constitutional Monarchy) can never be consolidated.

'This fact will be acknowledged when the reign of the Charlatan (Necker) is at an end. Madame de Mirabeau is right in attributing the check I met with on this point to him. I am more sorry for the public than for myself, for I have long said, *Malheur, malheur, aux peuples reconnaissants*.'

The Marquise de Saillant concludes her letter to her sister-in-law, with a judicious and touching appeal to the latter, on the possibility of a reconciliation with her husband. The editor remarks, that this letter, of which a minute in the hand-writing of Mirabeau exists among the papers, was written undoubtedly at his instigation; and if so, it is much to his credit, and places him in a new and favourable point of view.

Mirabeau's correspondence with La Marck, which occupies the concluding pages of the first volume, referred generally to the commencing difficulties of the situation of public affairs, caused by the incapacity of Necker, the pretensions and irresolution of La Fayette, the weakness of the Court, and the growing violence of the Democrats. Mirabeau at this time entertained

the project of placing the direction of affairs in the hands of Monsieur, the King's brother; a project, however, which received little countenance from the Queen, and probably even less from the King, for both were jealous of the comparative popularity of Monsieur, soon fell to the ground. These letters are full of spirited sarcasm, and are the most amusing in the collection.

In the letter dated 23d of December, 1789, is this passage (p. 436.), — ‘The atmosphere of the country is still the same; the mephitic influence of indecision and weakness, of envy and bad faith, corrupt, defile, and dissolve everything; at the Luxembourg (where Monsieur lived) they are afraid of being afraid; at the Tuileries the King is accustomed to every thing, except the *inconvenience of his residence*; the Queen remains within her retrenchment, “je ne me mêle de rien!” — the General (La Fayette) is the luckiest and most immoveable player at hazard in the world.’

On the 4th of January, 1790 (p. 447.), he writes: “Les cartes sont tellement mêlées dans ce tripot,” that it is very difficult for the most skilful player to make a good hit. This empire still sustains itself by its mass, but there is no movement in it; and although the natural principles of life may be good, without possessing all the energy supposed, it will die from decomposition, if not put, by some means or other, into motion.’

The following passage is curious as a speculation: ‘You view the Belgians as a Belgian. As for me, — who am convinced that no great empire can be well governed but by a division into small confederating states, and that ours will either be dissolved or so administered, — I feel assured that if our Government becomes wise, and our Constitution be matured, all the populations of the banks of the Rhine, beginning with your provinces, will range themselves under it, and then we shall at last see how far the conquests of liberty, and human reason can proceed.’

Mirabeau in this letter (p. 486.), continuing the vein of sarcasm on men and things, says, ‘La Fayette treats us with little evolutions, and Montmorin with little intrigues. St. Priest has more serious intentions, while the Tuileries and the Luxembourg alternately surpass each other in cowardice, carelessness, and versatility.’

In his last letter of this series, he says, ‘Monsieur La Fayette conspires in favour of royalty from gallantry. Our virtuosos do the same from corruption, while our democrats assist royalty, by their internal divisions and the miserable trickeries of their

‘personal interests.’ Mirabeau—although, with the exception of the attempt to make Monsieur minister, he did not, during Comte de La Marck’s absence from Paris, take any part in ministerial measures or arrangements—was very active, even to the injury of his health, in the Assembly; and, in the discussions on the internal organisation of the country, and on the various revolutionary outbreaks and resistance to the decrees of the Assembly which occurred in different parts of France, he made some of his best speeches.

No notice is taken in the ‘Correspondance’ of Mirabeau’s brilliant and successful exertions in the Assembly on the 22d of May, in combating the attempts of the Lameths, of Duport, and Barnave to place the right of declaring war and making peace exclusively in the Assembly. He obtained this success, too, at the moment when a pamphlet was hawked about the streets of Paris, entitled the ‘Grande Trahison du Comte Mirabeau.’ Barnave entered on this occasion the lists with Mirabeau, and was fairly beaten: La Fayette supporting Mirabeau, but apparently without any previous concert.

The first note addressed by Mirabeau to the Court, or rather to the Queen, as appears from his alluding to the daughter of Maria Theresa as his august auxiliary, is dated on the 1st of June, 1790, and relates entirely to the absolute necessity of reducing the influence of Monsieur La Fayette, with whom, however, Mirabeau had not ceased to communicate; for he says on the 4th of June (p. 34.), ‘I yesterday saw the man of in-  
‘decision.’ He in this letter strongly remonstrates against any clandestine escape of the King (of which a project was then entertained), ‘un Roi ne s’en va qu’en plein jour, quand c’est  
‘pour être Roi.’

The second note of Mirabeau, — nominally addressed to the Court, but, like the first, really to the Queen,—again feverts to La Fayette; but instead of seeking altogether to remove him, he recommends that the Queen should see La Fayette, and insist upon his publicly uniting himself with Mirabeau, and acting in entire concert. ‘All must be arranged by the Queen. ‘Le Roi n’a qu’un homme, c’est sa femme. . . .; The time will  
‘come, and that soon, when we must try what a woman and  
‘child can do on horseback; with her it is a family act.’ Mirabeau proposes that he should take the direction of the press, including pamphlets and newspapers, conduct all the correspondence, and exercise an influence over all appointments.

Mirabeau’s great object at this time was to be elected President of the Assembly, as the Festival of the Federation of all the National Guards of France was to take place on the 14th of

July. The King and Queen endeavoured to persuade La Fayette to support his nomination. The Queen was indiscreet in her language, pressing Mirabeau upon La Fayette, so much so, as not to conceal her preference of the former. In fact, she could not conceal her dislike of La Fayette, 'whom,' Droz says, 'she always looked upon as the King's jailor.' It is not surprising that such indiscreet urgency failed; and by La Fayette's assistance, the Marquis de Bonnai, a man generally esteemed by all parties, was chosen président. The fifth note of Mirabeau is full of invective against Monsieur Talon, then Lieutenant Civil au Chatelet, and deprecating his appointment to the office of Privy Seal to the King, and to the direction of the Civil List attached to the office.\* He describes him as altogether deficient in talent, and though wealthy, avaricious to the highest degree,—'A man,' he says, 'who has Senef as his treasurer, Semonville as his wit, Saint Foix as his counsel, La Fayette as his patron, the Affair Favras as his masterpiece, Brinville as his satellite, and Boucher d'Argis as his instrument.' Such personal attacks were not calculated to increase either the esteem or confidence of the Court, for the individuals named were all persons more or less trusted, as well as Mirabeau, if not by the Queen, yet certainly by the King.

Mirabeau, in his seventh note, gives very good advice on the manner in which the King should receive the Duke of Orleans on his return from England, which he recommends to be courteous and cordial. The eighth note is dated the 3d of July, which was the day on which the interview between the Queen and Mirabeau took place at St. Cloud, at eight o'clock in the morning. Mirabeau, in this note, compares the state of the royal authority under the ancient regime and under the actual one. He considers it highly advantageous to be without parliaments, without pays d'état (or provinces with representative assemblies), and generally without privileged bodies. The notion of having only one class, would have pleased Richelieu.

Our readers will with ourselves regret, that neither the Comte de La Marck nor Mirabeau give any details of the interview of

---

\* Mons. Talon left Paris after the 10th of August, and returned in 1801, was imprisoned for a short time during the Consulate in the Chateau d'If, and afterwards disappeared altogether from public life.

Monsieur Semonville was employed in the diplomatic service: he was arrested by the Austrian Government, and exchanged in 1795 against Madame the daughter of Louis XVI. He became Referendaire of the House of Peers, from which office he retired in 1834.

the latter with the Queen. The editor, to supply the deficiency gives an extract from the 'Memoirs of Madame de Campan,' who had the little she relates of the interview from the Queen herself. The Queen, on approaching Mirabeau, said to him:— 'With an ordinary enemy, and with a man who had sworn to destroy the Monarchy without appreciating its usefulness to a great nation, I feel that I should be now taking a most imprudent step, but I know that I am speaking to a Mirabeau.' This language was very adroit, for Mirabeau was essentially an aristocrat, and would have been mortified by being treated as one of the tiers-états. He wielded democracy as a club, but the weapon of his choice was the sword of the gentleman. According to Madame de Campan, Mirabeau left the Queen, saying, 'La Monarchie est sauvée.' In another account we learn that Mirabeau solicited the honour of kissing the Queen's hand, observing, that Maria Theresa, whenever she honoured a subject with an audience, gave him her hand to kiss.

Mirabeau writes, on the 17th July, to the Court, recommending the King and royal family to go to Fontainebleau, and suggests all the details of military escort on the route, and of the composition of the Guard of Honour during the residence there. He recommends that the utmost publicity should be given to the King's intention by a message from the King to the Assembly, and that La Fayette's support should be insisted upon. The journey to Fontainebleau, thus strongly recommended by Mirabeau, and which must have greatly improved the personal position of the royal family, never took place. The fifteenth note to the Court is a short and masterly sketch of the points of foreign policy that demanded the special attention of the French Government. Of this sketch, short as it is, England occupied the principal portion. Mirabeau, however willing to adopt the framework of the British constitution for France, partook largely of the vulgar suspicions of the English Government entertained by his countrymen.

Two notes are devoted to a better organisation of the Swiss regiments in the French service. We pass to the eighteenth note, and to a remarkable passage in it, evidently blaming the undue confidence which Mirabeau more than suspected was still given to La Fayette, and expressing his own increased discouragement. He dwells particularly upon engaging in a foreign war (arising out of the alliance with Spain) at a moment when the state of affairs at home required undivided attention: he ends this note thus:— 'I will wait till a clap of thunder breaks the lethargy which I cannot but deplore. In a conference easily concocted, many things upon which I am neither guessed

'at nor understood, might be explained.' That conference was never granted.

In the twenty-first note (p. 149.), Mirabeau discusses the financial embarrassments of the Government, he treats the measures of Necker as wholly inadequate to the crisis, and comes to the conclusion that an issue of paper on the security of the property of the clergy is the only means of preventing national bankruptcy. The following passage is worth notice:—'It is impossible to entertain too much apprehension of a bankruptcy — the most vigorous despotism could hardly stand the shock, but despotism is for ever ended in France. The Revolution may miscarry, the Constitution may be overthrown, and royalty torn into tatters by anarchy,—but the nation will never retrograde to despotism.' Mirabeau's sagacity here was at fault, for he did not take into account what might be achieved by a successful general when the country had become weary with the successive phases of anarchy. In our day the eventualities propounded by Mirabeau have occurred, and the question is still to be solved — 'Will France again retrograde to despotism? or will the absence of a successful general prevent it?'

In Mirabeau's opinion Necker would never be able or willing to execute the measures of regulating the issue of the assignats, and he therefore recommends his friend Clavière (who was, in fact, the author of the scheme) for the direction of this particular operation. There is a passage in Necker's work on his own administration, which shows that he was quite aware of the immediate convenience of a large issue of paper money, for he says, at its 142nd page: 'If the question of morality be excluded from an examination of the two great measures of the National Assembly, the seizure of Church property, and the payment of the debts of the State on the security of the saleable value of certain landed property, it is not to be denied that the combination of the two is the greatest and most rapid financial operation that can be imagined.' Necker, in forming his financial measures, thought of that day of reckoning, which must come sooner or later, while Mirabeau sought to get over the present difficulties, which so much impeded the political organisation of the Government. Necker retired from the ministry soon after the debate on the large issue of assignats.

The press was, in Mirabeau's opinion (p. 162.), the only resource left to the Government for influencing public opinion, and he proposes, in the twenty-third note, the getting up a cheap newspaper for the purpose. He remarks, 'that public opinion is not always the result of the general enlightenment of a

'nation. Some men anticipate this opinion, their contemporaries follow them, and hence it happens that the multitude blindly adopts errors as truths. At the epoch of a great revolution public opinion is formed suddenly, and almost accidentally. The more universal it is, the less it is enlightened, and it becomes the more dangerous because it assumes the character of the general will, and of the law.' Is not the justice of these observations confirmed by the Revolution of February, 1848, and the instantaneous establishment in France of a Democratic Republic?

We find in Mirabeau's twenty-ninth note (p. 209.) to the Court two passages so applicable to the present state of affairs in France, that we think them well worth extracting. 'Whatever be done, the charges of the new will be greater than those on the ancient regime, and on the whole, the people will judge the Revolution by this fact only; Will more or less money be taken from the pocket? Will there be more work? and, Will that work be better paid?' Again, 'We must act, not to excite opposition against bad laws, inevitable and necessary evils, but to direct opinion to an useful end, and that end is the legal and not violent reformation of the vices of the Constitution, whether in this Assembly, if the general discontent breaks out before it is replaced, or in a Second Legislature, by showing the necessity of assigning to it a constituent and ratifying authority.'

The Comte de La Marck had an interview with the Queen on the 9th of October, and his note of the 10th to Mirabeau gives the following brief account of the result (p. 221.): 'The Queen then gave assurances that she would communicate with La Fayette as if the ostensible concert still existed. The importance of spreading correct information in the provinces was felt; the means of doing this would be supplied, and the persons to be employed should be pointed out. He (the King) attached but little importance to the alliance with Spain.' Probably the King's indifference arose from the family compact being the act of Choiseul, for whom he had an hereditary aversion.

Mirabeau was again disappointed in the presidential election (p. 225.). Merlin was chosen; and he says the act threw more ridicule upon the Assembly than upon him. In his thirtieth note Mirabeau, answering questions propounded to him by La Marck, lays down the fundamental principles of the Constitution in these terms:—'Hereditary royalty in the Bourbon dynasty. A Legislature periodically elected and permanent, limited in its functions to framing laws. Unity



‘and very extensive power in the supreme Executive; authority over all matters belonging to the internal administration, to the giving effect to the law, and the command of the armed force. Taxation to be vested exclusively in the legislative body; a new division of the kingdom; justice free of charge; liberty of the press; responsibility of ministers; sale of church property; the re-establishment of a civil list; no distinction of orders; no privileges or pecuniary exemptions; no feudality; no parliaments; no nobility or clergy as separate bodies; no *pays d'états*; no provincial bodies. These are what I understand to be the fundamental principles of the Constitution. They only limit the royal power to strengthen it, and are perfectly reconcilable with monarchical governments.’ Mirabeau may have been, as La Fayette says, sold to the Court, but he certainly might have avowed such principles as these in the tribune of the Assembly.

Mirabeau recommended the Court to send literary men as agents into the provinces; and he says of them, that they are ‘a class of citizens independent in character, but wise and sagacious from a long study of men and things.’ He proposes a salary of 1000 livres a month for each agent; an outlay of 8000 livres for works directed to the guidance of public opinion; he takes 100,000 livres as the total of the expenditure for four or five years; the patronage of this service would necessarily have fallen into Mirabeau's hands. We apprehend that the commissaires sent after February, 1848, into the departments by the Provisional Government, did not perform their work as cheaply; and certainly not in the same principles or spirit.

The report of the diplomatic committee on the meeting of the squadron at Brest, contained the project of a decree requiring that the national colour, the tricolor, should be used on board ships of the royal navy instead of the white flag, and insisted upon the dismissal of the Ministers; it led to a very violent debate. Monsieur de Montmorin was, on an amendment, excepted from the vote. Mirabeau did not speak on the subject of the Ministers, but he made (probably under feelings of great vexation at the intervention of Bergasse in the confidential communications with the Court) a very violent speech on that part of the decree relating to the tricolor flag, and he proposed as an addition that the sailors should, instead of ‘*Vive le roi!*’ cry ‘*Vive la nation! vive le roi! vive la loi!*’ He also accused the Côté Droit of being counter-revolutionists.\*

---

\* It was on this occasion that he used the expression ‘*La Cocarde Tricolore fera le tour de l'Europe.*’

Such language gave great offence to the Court, and drew upon Mirabeau a strong remonstrance from La Marck. Mirabeau's answer (p. 251.) must have been written under feelings of great irritation, for he persists in the same tone of violence which had marked his speech, and is quite Jacobinical in his menaces. The only words of apology, or rather moderation, are these: 'Je suis l'homme du retablisement de l'ordre, et non de l'ancien ordre.' The Archbishop of Toulouse was in utter dismay on the perusal of this note. In writing to La Marck, he says, 'I return to you Comte Mirabeau's note, which I must own inspires me with horror.'

In the thirty-fourth note to the Court, Mirabeau endeavours to excuse his not speaking on the dismissal of the Ministers, by saying that he did not choose to support the motion for a partial dismissal, when the minister excepted, Comte de Montmorin, was especially commended as the friend of Monsieur La Fayette, — a cogent reason for dismissing, and not for retaining him. Mirabeau, with his accustomed assurance, treats very lightly the question of the flag. 'They will undoubtedly reproach me with having preferred the tricolor to the white flag, which their party wishes to maintain.' He is altogether silent on the most offensive part of his speech — the change in the rallying cry of the sailors. This note is mere evasion, and could not have lessened the just displeasure of the Court.

The thirty-fifth and thirty-sixth notes show that Mirabeau felt he had gone too far (pp. 257. and 262.), and he clothes his excuses in more submissive and palatable language. At the conclusion of the latter note, he says, 'My zeal was never so pure, my devotion more unbounded, my desire of being useful more constant, I might say more obstinate. It is not for myself, but for the success of the great object in view, that I court confidence, and those who may deprive me of it shall not tear from my heart, neither my gratitude, nor the oath I have taken to defend the royal authority, even if I combat alone, and fall in this noble struggle. I shall have Europe as a witness, and posterity as a judge.' These expressions, extravagant as they are, coming from Mirabeau were sincere. He was really anxious for the maintenance of the monarchy, and he had enthusiasm and courage sufficient to make every personal sacrifice, even that of life itself, in defending it. Had he not been somewhat lowered in his own estimation by being an unavowed and secretly paid adviser, he would probably have been less irritable and inconsistent.

The dissatisfaction produced at Court by Mirabeau's outbreak in the Assembly on the 19th did not last long, for on the 27th

Comte de La Marck writes to him that the Queen had no other reason for not seeing him but the fear of being compromised by it; circumstances had rendered her more manageable on the point, and if he persisted in thinking that minor objections should give way, it would be possible to obtain her consent to an interview.

The two letters from Comte de La Marck to Comte de Mercy d'Argenteau (pp. 281 to 289.) contain a summary of recent occurrences at Paris, and reflections thereon full of impartiality and good sense. The most interesting passages contain his opinion of Mirabeau. In the first letter he says, 'For this man is by turns very great and very weak,—he may be very useful and also very hurtful; in a word, he is often far above and far below other men.' And in the second, 'What a being that man is,—always on the verge of running wild or of being discouraged: by turns imprudent from excess of confidence or enervated from distrust. It is very difficult to guide him in affairs which require perseverance and prudence.' La Marck might well say that he had great difficulty in managing him.

From the time that the decree of the Assembly had excluded the King's ministers from the Assembly, and deprived Mirabeau of the great object of his ambition, all his recommendations to the Court tended to the establishment of confidential agents throughout the provinces, who should be named and directed by himself, independent of the nominal ministry. In the thirty-ninth note he goes a step further, and at the moment of forming a new ministry, he suggests that there should be attached to each minister a man of superior talents, who, without the title, would be the real head and moving power in the preparation and execution of all important measures. Mirabeau, as he had done before respecting the provincial agents, professes to be acquainted with men fit for these duties, or in other words, he is ready with agents of his nomination, who should be the real ministers.

It must be painful to those who feel an interest in the reputation of La Fayette to read the following passage in La Marck's letter to the Comte Mercy. 'He (La Fayette) had a few days since a long conference with the Queen: in it he employed the most odious language to alarm her; and he went so far as to say, that in order to obtain a divorce, she would be prosecuted for adultery. The Queen answered with the dignity, the courage, and the firmness of which you know her to be possessed. But one is filled with indignation in thinking of such behaviour from such a man as Monsieur La Fayette.' The statement of what passed at the conference must have come from the Queen

herself, and one really cannot see any sufficient reason for misrepresentation on her part.

The correspondence from the 9th to the 22d of November is occupied with the alleged appearance of Madame La Motte at Paris, the Pillage of the Hôtel de Castries by the Parisian mob in revenge for the Marquis de Castries having wounded Charles La Motte in a duel, and the application from the inhabitants of Avignon to be annexed to the French territory. Mirabeau is most vehement in the expression of his determination to defend the Queen against the base attempts of her enemies to injure her, by reviving the affair of the diamond necklace. Assuming the report of the appearance of Madame La Motte at Paris to be true (which he believed it to be), he suggests that the Garde de Sceaux should take the ordinary course of having her arrested, as having escaped from the house of correction, where she had been confined by a sentence of the Parliament. Mirabeau suspected that the Duke of Orleans had caused Madame La Motte to be brought to Paris for the purpose of injuring the Queen in public opinion, and that La Fayette was not indisposed to use the occurrence for his own purposes. The Comte de La Marek did not share Mirabeau's suspicions respecting the Duke of Orleans. Mirabeau's zeal on this occasion, as might be expected, was very gratifying to the Queen, and increased her confidence in him. Droz, who is in general observing and accurate, does not mention Madame La Motte's appearance in Paris, and certainly the supposed intrigue had no tangible result.

The language held by Mirabeau in the debate on the pillage of the Hôtel of the Marquis de Castries, and the duel with La Motte, was that of a violent Jacobin, approving, or at least not condemning the conduct of the mob. We learn from the letter of the Archbishop of Toulouse to Comte de La Marek, that the impression produced at Court was most unfavourable to Mirabeau; and that his speech on the 13th of October was regarded as 'an outbreak' from 'a tribune of the people,' who sought to justify its atrocities and to excite popular fury against those who notoriously were the friends of the King and of the monarchy.

Pethion de Villeneuve made a report to the Assembly in the name of the Avignon Committee, recommending compliance with the application of the inhabitants for annexation to France. Mirabeau succeeded in carrying the following amendment:—  
'The National Assembly, after having heard the report of the  
'diplomatic committee, postpones the consideration of the  
'application of the people of Avignon, and decrees that the  
'King shall be requested to send a body of troops to Avignon,

We pass to Mirabeau's forty-seventh note to the Court. This is by far the most important document in the Correspondence ; but it is of too great length, and enters into such detail, that we cannot pretend to give even an abstract of the whole ; we can only point out its most important suggestions. Mirabeau thus enumerates the obstacles to the formation of any systematic plan for establishing the royal authority, and saving the commonwealth from destruction. ' The indecision of the King, the prejudices existing against the Queen, the mad democracy of Paris, the bad spirit of the National Guards, the irritability of the Assembly, the little hold upon it on account of its mass, the insurmountable unpopularity of one section of it, the palliatives in preparation by the Committee of Revision, the impossibility of making use of a great portion of the discontented, from the divergence of their various interests, the direction which public opinion is taking towards party spirit, the fear of exciting a general conflagration if violent measures were employed, and above all, the order of things already established, already in motion, and the impossibility of obtaining any paramount result without retrograding, that is, without abrogating several decrees of the Assembly.'

The indecision of the King could only be surmounted by the private influence of the Queen, and in the Council, by concert among the Ministers. Mirabeau says of Paris, that it was the town of France in which public tranquillity would be restored the last, and that every effort should be made to destroy its influence in the provinces, and to produce a general desire that the next Legislature should meet in some other town, where its independence and the personal liberty of the King would be better protected. The National Guard of Paris is described as a most serious obstacle to the restoration of order : most of its chiefs were members of the Jacobin Club, and they would teach their soldiers to look upon the people as the first authority. Mirabeau proposes to establish a popularly organised household body of troops, as a rival to the National Guard, and to interest the provinces in the formation of this armed force, to induce the Assembly to refuse its assent to the measure, and thereby to make evident the influence of the city of Paris ; thus separating the capital from the rest of the kingdom.

It did not seem desirable to raise the question of ratification in the existing National Assembly, but to leave it to its successor. In the difficulty of determining at what period or periods the Constitution was to be revised, Mirabeau was of opinion that each succeeding Legislature should have constituent authority. Mirabeau was prepared for a great personal sacri-

fice; for he proposed that none of the Deputies in the National Assembly should be qualified for re-election, or at least that their qualification should be confined to the Department in which they had their domicile.

It was of importance to push the Assembly to acts of irregularity in assuming executive and administrative authority, but it was at the same time necessary to resist all decrees positively encroaching on the royal authority. The Assembly had shown itself dissatisfied with the conduct of some municipalities, and Mirabeau wished that it should be encouraged to destroy the rural municipalities, and to alter the local administration in towns, so as to spread a general feeling of dissatisfaction. The popularity of the Royal Family should be restored by the King and Queen frequently appearing in public, attending the reviews of the National Guard, and the debates in the National Assembly, where they might occupy the Tribune of the President; they should visit the hospitals and charitable institutions, and judiciously make pecuniary donations. No object would be gained by hastening the dissolution of the present Assembly. On the contrary, it was better to give it time for self-destruction. The Ministers might add to the embarrassments of the Assembly by overwhelming it with Reports, pointing out the difficulties of executing decrees that were contradictory and ill-digested.

Should the Assembly be compelled from the loss of all influence to dissolve itself, the King ought immediately to call another, and declare himself the guardian of all the advantages gained by the people; failing this self-dissolution, every exertion must be made to obtain an interval between the dissolution of the one, and the meeting of the other Assembly. In the interval, the royal authority would derive strength and consideration. Mirabeau erroneously assumes as a parallel case, the increased power of the Crown in England, while the House of Commons is not sitting. To obtain influence over the National Assembly, he proposes a committee of twelve deputies, — Bonnay, L'Abbé Montesquion for the Côté Droit, Clermont Tonnerre, D'André, Duquesnoy, L'Evêque D'Autun, Emmery, Chapelier, Thouret, Barnave, and himself, for the Assembly generally. They were not all to be equally trusted, nor to be brought together at any one time. The Côté Droit, Clermont Tonnerre, and D'André were not to be made acquainted with the concert of the others; nor were Chapelier and Thouret to know that Mirabeau and Barnave were their auxiliaries; nor was Barnave to be made aware that there was any coalition between Mirabeau and any other deputy. He (Barnave) should

always be seen alone. Duquesnoy\* was considered the best channel of communication between the twelve deputies and the Minister Comte de Montmorin. The several deputies were to use their influence with their personal friends, and thus secure a general support. Bribery might be successfully employed to gain the votes of deputies. Mirabeau recommended that the secret police of Paris should be entrusted to Talon and Semonville. The faithful devotion of the former might be secured by the promise of a great office, a person whose name is left in a dotted line was to be gained by money, and such promises must be most strictly kept. It was not, however, necessary, that the whole scheme should be known to Talon and Semonville; prudence required that entire cognisance of it should be confined to Montmorin and Mirabeau. Unanimity in the council of Ministers was indispensable. Forty agents were to be despatched into the departments, two to be attached to each, and a commission for the circulation of useful political pamphlets was to be established, under the management of Clermont Tonnerre. Mirabeau concludes by saying, 'If this plan be followed, every thing may be hoped for; if it be not,—if this last plank slips from under us, there is no misfortune from individual assassination and pillage, from the overthrow of the throne to the dissolution of the empire, that may not be anticipated.'

Under this plan Comte de Montmorin was not to have a sinecure. The following is the tableau of his regular conferences:—

*Monday*, with the Chief of the Office for Political Works, from nine to eleven; with Mirabeau, from eleven to one. *Tuesday*, with Messrs. Talon and Semonville, from nine to eleven; with Mirabeau, from eleven to one. *Wednesday*, with the Head of the Correspondence Department, from eight to ten; and Mirabeau, from ten o'clock to midnight. *Thursday*, with Mirabeau, and the persons to whom the plan is known, from ten o'clock to midnight. *Friday*, with Monsieur Duquesnoy and Mirabeau, from nine till midnight. *Saturday*, with Messrs. Talon and Semonville (we presume at night), from nine to eleven; and with Mirabeau, from eleven to one. *Sunday*, with the Head of the Correspondence Department and Mirabeau, from ten o'clock to midnight.

\* Duquesnoy became subsequently a violent Terrorist: was on the cessation of the Reign of Terror brought to trial, and condemned: he put himself to death on his way to the scaffold. He must be the Duq . . .; one of the several bribed deputies of whose visits M. Montmorin was so much ashamed. (*Mémoires de Mallet du Pan*, vol. i. p. 23.)

This memoir was communicated to Malouet, and a conference took place between Mirabeau and him, at the Comte de Montmorin's. Malouet has left a Report of this conference which is found in Droz (vol. iii. p. 340.). The following is the most striking passage in this Report: 'His voice thundering as in the Tribune, his animated gestures, the abundance and justness of his ideas electrified me. I threw aside all my prejudices, all my doubts, and I found myself sharing his conviction, praising his project and his courage, exalting his means of success, but my peroration vexed him, — You will repair better than any one the mischief you have done.' Mirabeau vehemently denied the imputation, and threw the blame upon the '*modérés*' like Malouet, who had not appreciated him, upon the Ministers, who had never moved without making a false step, and upon the stupid Assembly, which never rightly understood what it said or did.

We have before said that Mirabeau had an intuitive aptitude for dealing with a revolutionary crisis, and it is difficult to determine whether he were more fitted to set up a Revolution, or to guide it when once put in motion. No other scheme could possibly have been propounded at the time, when the memoir was given in, which would have had a greater chance of success; but we believe that the revolutionary spirit was then too universally explosive to have been kept down by pamphlets, newspapers, or personal agency, however ably written or dexterously exerted. The excited populace of Paris in those days, as in the present, could only be controlled by a large army, and the royal authority was wholly unprovided with military means for self-defence, or for the maintenance of public tranquillity.

The memoir is very defective on this point, and does not go beyond the mention of a body of household troops for the personal protection of the King and the Royal Family. It seems to us, that the most practical part of the scheme was the means to be employed for managing the Assembly; and as this branch would have been conducted under the immediate superintendence of Mirabeau, there was reason to have anticipated success; but without that superintendence the result was always problematical and so, indeed, it turned out.

The Queen very reluctantly consented to give her confidence to Comte de Montmorin, and used against the employment of Messrs. Talon and Semonville the language which had been held by Mirabeau himself against them. Mirabeau's great objection to these individuals had been their devotion and subjection to La Fayette; and when convinced that their sentiments towards the latter had entirely changed, he was ready to give them his con-



fidence, more especially as one important part of their employment was to undermine the influence of La Fayette. Montmorin himself had been equally obnoxious to Mirabeau, as the attached colleague of Necker, and, like Talon and Semonville, connected with La Fayette; he had therefore at one time laboured to destroy the influence of all three with the Court, and it was not surprising that the Queen should have hesitated to accede at once to the change in the confidential agency proposed to her. La Marek had held the same language as Mirabeau, and although his representations had always had, from his unblemished personal character and social position, infinitely more weight with the Queen, he felt the difficulty in overcoming prejudices which he had himself created. We refer our readers to his note (p. 513.). Even while recommending the employment of Semonville, Comte de La Marek says of him — ‘This man is another intrigant, dexterous, enterprising, greedy of money, always calm in business, faithful from self-interest, a traitor whenever he sees an advantage in being so, intimate with all parties, without committing himself to any.’ After this character there can be no doubt that the initial S. used in a former letter meant Semonville.

The Editor has quoted at length (pp. 518 and 519.) from Droz a very curious account of an interview between Talon, then Lieutenant Civil, and Favras, in prison, a few days before the execution of the latter, for a plot to carry off the King to Peronne. Talon at this interview obtained possession of a document drawn up by Favras, which was his confession, and which would have deeply implicated Monsieur and the Queen; he further succeeded in persuading the unfortunate Favras to submit to his fate in silence. We have ourselves heard that the document was in existence at the Restoration, and was voluntarily given up to Louis XVIII. La Marek, who saw the paper, does not attach as much importance to its contents as Droz, but he admits that Talon by keeping it secret had rendered a great service.

La Marek's letter of 30th December, 1790, contains an admirable report on the existing state of affairs at Paris; and that part which relates to the ministerial colleagues of Comte de Montmorin is particularly interesting. Dupont du Terre, the keeper of the seals, was a slave of the Lametins, and a dangerous enemy of the Queen, and owed to Comte de Montmorin that he should not, were the question to arise, oppose her being brought to trial — this man had been forced upon the King by La Fayette.

Duportail, the Minister of War, was not the minister of the King, but of the Military Committee of the Assembly. De

Lessart, in the opinion of La Marck, was an abler man than the other two, but he was timid and irresolute. Even of Montmorin he says — ‘He wants that decision and irresistible ascendancy which mark the real statesman, and without which all other qualities are comparatively useless.’ Thus one important element of Mirabeau’s scheme — union among the members of the Ministry — did not exist, and perhaps no Ministry could have been formed at the time in which it would have sufficiently prevailed.

It was of the utmost importance to conceal Mirabeau’s connexion with the Court, and more especially the pecuniary part of it: he was known to be very much embarrassed in his private fortune, and therefore any lavish expenditure of money by him in living or purchases would naturally excite attention, and justify suspicion of the quarter from whence he obtained the means. Notwithstanding these very obvious reasons for prudence and caution, Mirabeau, about this time, made large purchases of books, and through Duquesnoy suggested the acquisition of a country house. Talon was much alarmed and remonstrated, as did the Comte de La Marck. Mirabeau was offended by the interference of the former, of which he complained in a letter (p. 18.) to La Marck, and uses this expression with respect to Talon — ‘Un tel Mentor est un peu mascarade pour moi.’ He excuses the purchase of books as being an investment adding to the value of his library, which was the only part of his property free from incumbrance: his irritation led him to suspect that there was a wish to get rid of him, which he says persons who ‘vogueut de jour au jour,’ and were not prepared to follow his plan, might naturally entertain.

Mirabeau’s popularity was at this period, the month of January, 1790, undiminished, for he was elected commandant of a battalion of the National Guard, and a member of the administration of the departments; he accepted the former situation with the concurrence of Comte de Montmorin, but he had not time to wait for the sanction of the Court, and his forty-seventh note is (p. 9. vol. iii.) explanatory of his conduct. Mirabeau thought, as the commandants of the battalions of the National Guard when on duty were in the habit of accompanying the Dauphin in his walks, that use might be made of those opportunities for confidential communications to the Queen orally or in writing. He says, ‘accustomed to do many things at once (and on that account it may be said I do them very badly) I might at the same time play at bowls or at nine pins, and the Dauphin would lose nothing in all that.’

In reading the Correspondence it is always a satisfaction to come to any letter of Comte de La Marck to Comte Mercy,

and we have a very interesting one of the 16th January, 1791. The audience which Talon had sought with the King was at last granted, and gave great satisfaction to the former. The difference in manner between Louis XVI. and his Queen was strongly marked on the occasion. 'The King, in this audience, showed his usual bonhomie, and brusquerie. The Queen, who came to it, was on the contrary full of quickness, tact, judgment and grace. She even showed that measured reason which you and I have so often recommended to her, and which is so necessary in her present situation.' It appears from this letter that little progress had been made in carrying Mirabeau's plan into execution. None of the travelling agents had set off, and the *Atelier des Ouvrages*, the manufactory of pamphlets, had not been established. In fact, the only part in action was the secret Police under Talon and Semonville, and that was likely to absorb large sums of money, as the persons employed expected to be 'gorged with gold.' La Marck here truly observes, that the 'plan, perfect in theory, would be of very difficult execution.' The Comte gives very good reasons for this opinion, one of which is the character of Montmorin, whom he designates as the weakest man of his acquaintance, and yet this very man is 'notre unique ressort.' There is in this letter a very serious charge against La Fayette, whom the Comte accuses of 'having contributed by the most odious intrigues to augment the distrust of the Emperor, and consequently of the Queen.' The Comte was almost alarmed at the recent increase of Mirabeau's popularity; for he feared, that if ever Mirabeau lost confidence in the Government, and placed all his glory in popularity, he would become insatiable of it. 'And you know as well as I do, Mons. de Comte, what popularity is in a time of Revolution.' The Comte felt greatly discouraged, and indeed disgusted with the country, the men, the laws, and the manners. The King had no energy whatever, and Montmorin had with sorrow told the Comte, that when he spoke to his Majesty on public affairs and on his own position, the King seemed to take as little interest in what was said, as if the matters treated of related to the Emperor of China. La Marck continued his services—entirely from devotion to the Queen, and he deeply commiserated her condition. 'As a wife she was bound to a sluggish being, and as a queen she was placed on a tottering throne.' The Comte de La Marck persuaded Montmorin to take the opportunity of his accompanying his sister Comtesse Starhemberg to Strasburg, to put him in communication with Mons. Bouillé, whose head-quarters were at Metz. Mirabeau at length obtained the President's Chair of the

Assembly. We do not find in the Correspondence any notice of a very able report of the then existing relations of France with Foreign Powers, which Mirabeau made in the name of the Diplomatic Committee on the day before his election as President the 28th of January, 1791. The object of the Report was to calm the irritation caused by the rumours, of the breaking out of war, which were for mischievous purposes circulated among the people. Droz says of Mirabeau's conduct in the President's Chair, that 'even his enemies admitted that no man had presided over the Assembly with so much dignity. All admired his manner of directing the discussions, and his mode of summing up the result; he often acted as a Moderator. He always showed his respect for the Assembly and obtained it for himself. The deputations which appeared at the Bar, were unusually numerous—he delighted to seize these occasions of oratorical success, and that success his answers to the deputations never failed to procure.'

The Comte de La Marck has not left among his papers his reports to Comte de Montmorin on the communications with the Marquis de Bouillé; and neither in his letter to the Queen (p. 59.), nor in that to Comte Mercy (p. 67.), do we find any statement which would supply the absence of the documents themselves. From the memoirs of De Bouillé we learn that he was made acquainted with Mirabeau's connexion with the Court, and that he entirely approved of the plan suggested by him, and was ready to give every aid to the execution of it. De Bouillé says that Mirabeau was to place the King in his hands either at Compiegne or Fontainbleau, where he would have surrounded him with the best troops. La Marck considered (we think without sufficient ground) that the successful departure of Mesdames from Paris showed that the King might easily have done the same; and if so, might, as was proposed, have reached Compiegne. At all events, the moment gave a better chance of success, than when the attempt at escape was actually made.

Comte Montmorin, in a letter of 9th February, informs Mirabeau that a committee of twelve, members of the Assembly, amongst whom were some of those included in Mirabeau's plan, was about to be formed, for the purpose of directing and bringing to a close the proceedings of the National Assembly. The Committee was to meet at La Fayette's. From this we might suppose that Montmorin had not been made acquainted with a previous meeting at Emmercy's between La Fayette and Mirabeau when this very project was discussed. The meeting was held on the 8th of February, the day of La

Marck's departure from Paris, and, therefore, a day prior to this letter of Montmorin.

The Assembly, yielding to the wishes of the Commune de Paris, had decided that a project of law on the emigrants should be prepared by the Committee on the constitution. Chapelier, in presenting the report of the Committee, stated that the project of a law had, after serious discussion, been prepared, but that the Committee felt great hesitation in submitting it, as it violated the constitution. Mirabeau, in one of his most brilliant speeches, opposed the passing any law on the subject of emigration, which was not only unconstitutional, but in its very essence tyrannical, and concluded his first speech, for he spoke more than once on the occasion, by these words, 'If you pass a law against emigrants, I swear never to obey it.' The debate was throughout violent and tumultuous, and it was in one of the most violent explosions of opposition that he exclaimed, 'Silence aux trente voix,' and looked defiance at the bench where the Lameths, Duport, and others were seated with a small fraction of the Assembly. His personal success was great, but he did not carry his motion, and the question, on the proposition of Vernier, was adjourned, it being understood that the subject should be referred to the committees separately, and that a joint report should be prepared by commissaries selected by the committees.

The Lameths, reduced to silence in the Assembly, renewed the attack upon Mirabeau at the Jacobin Club; here again he boldly met them, and was equally successful, although his opponents were, it might be said, on their own ground, as Mirabeau had latterly seldom attended the sittings of the Club; and his conduct in the Assembly could not have been satisfactory to the majority of its members. He concluded his defence by the words, 'I will belong to you even till ostracism.'

These two occurrences thus brought together give us a measure of the wonderful influence which Mirabeau exercised over popular assemblies, even when those assemblies were in paroxysms of excitement, which would seem to make eloquence unavailing and reasoning impossible. It is singular that Montmorin should have supposed that Mirabeau had failed in defending himself against the attack made upon him at the Jacobin Club; he was equally mistaken as to the result of the debate on the project of the law on emigrants, which he supposed had been adopted by the Assembly.

Mirabeau's letters to La Marck (pp. 78 and 82.) contain bitter complaints against Duquesnoy, Talon, and Semonville: the former had written a foolish letter to the Jacobin Club,

which had undone all the good that Mirabeau's speech had produced; and Talon and Semonville had allowed the newspapers to take a tone favourable to La Fayette, and hostile to Mirabeau. Beaumetz, Chapelier and D'André, all supposed to belong to the committee of twelve created by his plan, had been in communication with Danton, and had proposed the destruction of the dungeon of Vincennes to gain popularity, and hesitated to oppose the law on emigrants, from the fear of losing it. Danton, Mirabeau asserts, had received 30,000 francs. There was evidently no confidence or real concert among the agents employed to carry the different parts of Mirabeau's plan into execution; he himself trusted and respected no one with whom he was acting but La Marck; and, on the other hand, the persons of whom he complains winced under his dictation, had no real consideration for him, and may have entertained doubts of his honesty.

In p. 92. there is a note of Comte de La Marck's on the subject of the legislation on mines, in which he as a proprietor was deeply interested; the principles at issue were, whether the working of mines should be conceded to individuals, proprietors of the soil, or whether the mines should be considered the absolute property of the State. Mirabeau, from conviction, adopted the first; but his motive for devoting all his energy to obtain the application of the principle, maintaining the rights of proprietors, was his friendship for La Marck. The 27th of March was the day of the final discussion; he came to La Marck at nine o'clock in the morning, so ill and weak that he fainted. On recovering he persisted, notwithstanding La Marck's remonstrances, on going to the Assembly, where he made one of his ablest speeches, abounding in accurate details, sound principles, and conclusive argument. Mirabeau returned to La Marck's at three o'clock, and on entering the room he threw himself on a sofa, saying, 'Your cause is gained, but I am dead.' La Marck helped him to his carriage, and accompanied him to his house, 'd'où il ne sortit plus que pour être conduit au tombeau.'

The last note from Mirabeau in the Correspondence (p. 105.), is dated the 24th of March, and relates to the Regency Question. He was much alarmed at the course taken by the Abbé Sieyès on the occasion: his expressions are — 'Be assured that they wish to bring us back to the elections, that is to say, to the destruction of the hereditary principle, and to that of the monarchy. The Abbé Sieyès has never so courted and jobbed with the Assembly as now, and his partisans are numerous. Be sure, my dear Comte, that I do not exaggerate the danger.'

' Oh ! inconstant ! and thrice inconstant people ! Two thirds of our troops are, on this question, with the Abbé Sieyès — Vale et me ama.'

' We think that the perusal of the Correspondence up to this point will bear out our observations at the commencement of this Article, that the beneficial influence which Mirabeau's peculiar qualities and energy might have exerted on the progress of the Revolution may be supposed, but cannot be said to have shown itself at the time of his death ; for we believe that the democratic spirit had already taken too firm hold on the lower classes, to have been subdued by what we will call moral and intellectual agencies. The brutal passions of the populace in Paris, and in other large towns, had been excited, acts of murder and violation of property had been committed with impunity, the administration of justice had been interrupted and disorganised, insubordination prevailed in the army, the King and Queen had been personally insulted, and while traditional and unhesitating obedience had disappeared for ever, respect for the greatly limited authority of the sovereign had not succeeded. The National Assembly, itself intimidated, was powerless for repression, and the majority of the members must have felt, that although they might, in decrees, frame a Constitution for the monarchy, practical adhesion to it depended not upon the King or the Assembly, but upon the will of a misled and turbulent populace. Against such a combination of evils there was little hope that time would be left for the development of Mirabeau's plan, which, though comprehensive in its details and definite in its object, was too complex and refined for prompt and general efficacy. His death, therefore, was probably more opportune for his reputation than hurtful to the cause which he had espoused. It is easy for Brissot to declare, that Mirabeau, if he had lived, would have killed the Revolution. On the contrary, we quite agree with the excellent remarks in the ' *Mémoires* of Mallet du Pan,' just published : ' Mirabeau died *à propos* for his fame and for the poetic satisfaction of future generations. A few more days would, perhaps, have only served to give him time to descend into the obscure ranks of the martyrs of reason and moderation, and to die defeated. By this time, possibly, he might be no more spoken of than the virtuous Bailly. The great Mirabeau might be nothing more to us than the brilliant orator of the Constituent Assembly, and an illustrious victim of the ingratitude of revolutions. As to the conditions on which he allied himself with the Court, and whether his political conscience went along with him in the transaction ? These questions have at length been settled, and justice done to this eminent man ; who, in

'this bargain, made his services be paid for, but did not sell his opinions.'

Mirabeau, licentious, prodigal, and of doubtful probity in private life, appears in this Correspondence a consistent politician, notwithstanding the apparent inconsistency of attempting to serve two masters; who, though in truth their interests were the same, did not themselves think so. From the opening of the *Etats Généraux* to his death he had but one purpose in view—the establishment in France of a limited monarchy. He accepted money from the Court as a salary, not as a bribe, and his position really was that of a confidential adviser of the Crown, though not an ostensible minister. His personal ambition was honourable in its end, and such as any modern statesman might have avowed, that of being first in the councils of a sovereign who claimed no greater authority than the Constitution gave, and the welfare of the nation required. Meantime, he was quite right in foreseeing that the publication of these papers was essential to the vindication of his memory with posterity. The revelation of the nature of his secret relations with the Court would have been fatal to his character, unless it had been accompanied with a knowledge equally complete of the use he sought to make of his popularity with the people and his influence with the King. Yet, after allowing Mirabeau the full benefit of the evidence as it stands, it is impossible to reconcile the false colours, which he wore, and his underhand receipt of money, with the character and conduct of a straightforward, highminded, independent man. Many others may have been equally compromised. But there can be no security for public integrity and private honour, and no confidence between man and man, where such exceptions are admitted.

The great interest of these papers ceases with the death of Mirabeau; and even were it otherwise, as we have already exceeded our prescribed limits, we must here bring our examination of the 'Correspondence' to an end, and leave the third part of the work without any detailed notice; at the same time we must observe, that the remaining letters from Comte de La Marck, from Comte Montmorin, from Monsieur Pellenc; and from Comte Mercy d'Argenteau will amply repay the trouble of perusal.

We cannot conclude without pointing out the admirable manner in which Monsieur Bacourt has performed the duty of editor. The notes which he has appended to the original letters and narratives, are so useful and complete, that readers not familiar with the history of the particular period, are relieved from the necessity of reference to contemporary writers, for explanation.



ART. VI. — *The Metamorphoses of Apuleius.* Translated from the Latin by Sir GEORGE HEAD. London: 1851.

ON inquiring lately at an old book-shop for an Apuleius, we were told by the bookseller that since the appearance of this translation, he had disposed of many copies of the original, which had long been a dead weight on his shelves. Sir George Head has recalled his author to the attention of scholars, and may, with good reason, feel flattered by this success, even if disappointed in his expectation that readers will resort to the book for 'the light and amusing qualities of a romance.' The *Metamorphoses* of Apuleius are not suited to modern taste, though they well deserve notice. Cervantes probably drew from them a hint for Don Quixote's adventure with the wine-skins; Boccaccio undoubtedly had read them; and the legend of Cupid and Psyche furnished subjects for the frescos with which Raphael adorned the walls of the villa at Rome, which is now called the Farnesina. The structure of the story is like that of *Gil Blas*. In both the adventures of the hero form the groundwork; but in both also, more than half the book consists of stories and incidents from their own lives, told by the different personages. This resemblance is probably due to the fact, that Apuleius, like Le Sage, worked up into his book materials provided by preceding novelists.

There existed at that time a class of literary compositions, called Milesian Tales, the character of which we are at no loss to determine from incidental notices, though no specimens are now extant. Aristides of Miletus, an author whose date is not precisely known, first composed them, and to him they owe their designation. He was followed by other writers, whose names the curious may find preserved in the *Bibliotheca Scriptorum Græcorum*. The only circumstance worth our observing is, that this species of literature sprang up at the point of meeting between the Grecian and Eastern worlds. Owing partly to their adoption of Persian habits, and partly also to their political insignificance, the Greeks of Asia Minor turned their attention more and sooner than the Athenians to pursuits which minister to the refinement and elegance of life. We have a curious proof of this in the impression produced in Athens at an earlier period, by the accomplishments of the ladies of Ionia. Aspasia was a native of Miletus, and not only was her house the resort of the philosophers of the day, but according to Plato, she even gave lessons in rhetoric to Pericles and Socrates. We do not suppose he is to be taken to the letter, but the story

shows that education in Ionia was less exclusively directed than in Athens, towards public life, in which men alone could engage; but embraced within its sphere a dilettante study of morals, unaccompanied by the severity of practice, and also of philosophy clothed in that light and graceful drapery in which eloquence can disguise it. To this same turn of mind we attribute the productions of which we are speaking. They first appear in Greek literature at a time when all interest in politics had died out, and men, instead of living in public, as their forefathers had done, courted retirement and privacy. In many cases, such a life was one of voluptuous indulgence; in most, a life of intellectual poverty; and these tales became popular, because they relieved the ennui of idleness. This sufficiently explains their character. They were familiar, trifling compositions, containing descriptions of the laughable incidents of life, amusing pieces of fiction, and adventures in love and intrigue, mixed with great licentiousness. The Romans first became acquainted with them during their campaigns in Lesser Asia. Plutarch tells us that the officers of Crassus's army carried the novels of Aristides in their knapsacks. Their popularity induced Sisenna, the historian of the expedition, to translate them into Latin; but though Ovid mentions the fact of their publication, we hear no more of them during the golden period of Roman literature. In the next century, however, they again came into vogue, and must have been well known to the readers of Apuleius; for in his preface, he promises to string together his stories in the Milesian strain, and charm their ears with a merry whispering.

He has kept his promise. His story contains a pleasant account of the habits, the follies, and even the vices of his contemporaries. He had enjoyed extensive opportunities for observation, for he spent his early years in Africa, studied at Athens, and, for some years, practised at the bar in Rome; and as the result, he exhibits to us a collection of portraits taken from different classes of society, sufficiently resembling the sketches made by the satirists of the preceding century, to convince us of their truth, but less harshly drawn. There is the usurer, — the enchantress taking vengeance on her lover, — the harsh stepmother, — the hectoring soldier, — the oppressed provincial, — the Christian woman, — the interior of a workshop, — and the juggling priests of the Syrian goddess. Every picture tells its own date; the gallery was made under the Empire.

But Apuleius was a philosopher as well as a satirist, and desired, in portraying, to reform his generation. We are aware that this has been denied by many critics, both in ancient

and modern times; but on any other supposition a large portion of the book is unintelligible, and inconsistent with what we know of his character. Our best plan will be to tell the story, and then give the explanation; following his own words as far as possible, though at the risk of falling into his faults of style. It is but fair to add, that in our quotations we have taken great liberties with Sir George Head's translation.

Lucius, the hero of the novel, is introduced to us mounted on a milk-white steed, upon a journey from Corinth to Thessaly. In the way he overtook a commercial traveller, engaged in earnest conversation with a friend. The subject of their discussion was suited to the spot in which they were travelling, for they were discussing the pretensions of magic on the borders of Thessaly, — the chosen home of witchcraft from the days of Medea even to the present hour. Lucius overheard the loud laugh with which the friend scouted the merchant's story, and was tempted, by his thirst for the marvellous, to introduce himself to them as a man eager for information. He reproved the unbelieving listener in words, which, though intended to convey to us the real scepticism of the novelist, flattered the speaker into repeating his tale. It related the untimely death of an acquaintance, brought about by the incantations of a hag, — a fact of which the merchant had been himself a witness on some former expedition into Thessaly, to procure the honey and cheese for which the district was famous. The story was good enough to beguile the remainder of a toilsome journey, but is not worth our repeating. It is enough to say, that, though supported by the devout belief of the narrator, and the common talk of all the people of Thessaly, it failed to convince the sceptical companion, while the cautious Lucius, when appealed to, gave his verdict that nothing is impossible, but all things proceed according to the decree of fate; 'for,' continued he, 'occurrences happen in the experience of us all, so wonderful, as to have been within an ace of never happening at all.'

The tale thus ended, Lucius parted company at the entrance of Hypata, and inquired for the house of Milo, to whom he had a letter of introduction. Milo was one of a numerous and powerful class, which owed its origin to the imperfect state of commercial credit, and the difficulty of finding secure and ready investment for capital under the Roman Empire; he was a miser and a money-lender. The influence and extortions of his order had more than once invited the interference of stringent laws, and exposed its members to popular hatred; and the old inn-keeper, who directed Lucius, did not miss the opportunity

of speaking an ill word of her wealthy neighbour, who kept one maid for himself and his wife, and dressed like a beggar.

The door of the house was bolted fast; but, after a parley with the maid, who mistook him for a customer come to borrow, Lucius was admitted to see Milo. The money-lender was reclining upon a tiny couch, on the point of beginning his evening meal. His wife was sitting at his feet, and before them was a bare table, to which he pointed, and said, 'You see 'all we have to offer.' Then, bidding his wife rise, and dragging his unwilling guest into her place, he apologised for the want of furniture, on the ground of his dread of robbers, and, after a compliment on the handsome figure of Lucius, and his almost feminine delicacy of manners, invited him to occupy a nook in his cottage. Lucius accepted the invitation; but, observing Milo's parsimonious style of living, determined to forage for himself on his way to his evening bath. Accordingly he went to the market, and bought a basket of fish. Just then he was recognised by an old friend, named Pythias, whose dress and retinue showed him to be a magistrate. The two had not met since their school-days at Athens, and Pythias had now become an ædile and an inspector of the market. He caught sight of the basket, and inquired what had been given for the bargain. The price was exorbitant; and, on hearing it, he grasped Lucius by the hand, and, leading him back to the stall, in the harshest tone which the majesty of the ædile could assume, threatened to show the fishmonger how rogues should be treated. Then, emptying the basket in the middle of the road, he ordered one of his attendants to trample upon the fishes; and, satisfied with his own sternness, advised his friend to come away, adding, 'The disgrace is punishment enough for the old fellow.' Lucius stood aghast at this rigorous system of administration; but there was no help for it; so, deprived alike of his money and his fish, and, wearied by his long journey and an evening without any supper, except Milo's conversation, he betook himself to rest.

We will take this opportunity of making our readers more intimately acquainted with the female portion of Milo's household—Pamphile and Fotis. The popular belief of Hypata represented the former as a notorious witch,—the mistress of every sepulchral incantation. By the slightest puff of her breath upon a branch or a stone, or any other inanimate object, she could extinguish the light of the heavenly bodies, and plunge the world in the darkness of chaos. She became enamoured of every handsome youth she met, and if he refused to

gratify her passion she changed him into some brutish form. Fotis was her mistress's confidante, and herself an adept in magic; but her knowledge was not accompanied by the impatience and dark temper which characterised Pamphile. On the contrary, she was pert and coquettish, and readily responded to, if she did not anticipate, the advances of Lucius. His fancy was taken by her elegant figure, her graceful motions, and, above all, her luxuriant and unadorned tresses, to the praises of which he has devoted a chapter; and he determined to follow up an intimacy, which, besides its own attractions, promised him an opportunity of gaining the knowledge he was in search of. We shall presently see what were its consequences.

One incident during his stay in Hypata is too important to the plot to be omitted. There was a noble and virtuous matron, named Byrrhæna, who took a deep interest in him, and warned him against the dangerous company he had fallen into. It chanced that this lady gave a magnificent entertainment, at which all the fashion of the place was to be present, and she invited Lucius to join the party. Fotis, though unwillingly, gave her consent, on condition he would return early, for fear of the mad-headed band of young nobles who infested the streets and massacred the passers-by. The supper was excellent; the wine flowed freely; one of the guests told how he had lost his ears and his nose, owing to a witch; jokes were bandied from side to side, and it was late before Lucius, with dizzy head and uncertain step, returned to Milo's house. There he saw three tall figures, to all appearance robbers, dashing against the door with the utmost violence. Without a moment's delay he charged into the midst of them, and engaged each in turn, till all three fell, pierced with wounds, at his feet.

Aurora was already shaking her rosy arm above the glowing trappings of her horses,—the fine writing is Lucius's, not ours,—and mounting towards the top of heaven, when night restored him to day. His mind was agitated by the remembrance of the last night's deed. With his legs bent under him, his hands clasped and resting on his knees, he sat up in bed, and wept abundantly, while his imagination pictured a court, a trial, a conviction, and the executioner. At this moment the lictors arrived to arrest him on a charge of murder, and conducted him to the theatre, the only place large enough to accommodate the crowds assembled to witness the trial. The prefect of the night-watch stated the charge, and Lucius was called upon for his defence. He admitted the fact, but repeating word for word the language of their leader, which left no doubt of their intentions, and describing the violence of their

attack on himself, and the deadly grip he had felt, he asked for a triumphant acquittal. By a procedure allowed in Greek Courts, the widow of one of the deceased, with an infant in her arms, was now produced, in order to excite the commiseration of the judges, and, at her instance, the accused was compelled to lift the sheet which covered the corpses. Beneath it lay three wine-skins, slashed with gaping holes, which his recollection told him corresponded with the wounds inflicted on the robbers.

The laughter, which had been with difficulty suppressed during the trial, now burst into the loudest peals of merriment. The day was the festival of the Lord of Laughter—the patron saint of Hypata, and required annually for its celebration the invention of some new amusement. For this purpose the trial had been devised. Lucius received the explanation with all the composure he could muster; but was hardly appeased even by the honour of a statue, and being enrolled among the patrons of the city. Fotis, in tears, accounted for the rest. She had been sent to the barber's shop for some of the hair of a young man with whom her mistress was in love; but the barber threatened to inform against her; so, fearing to return empty-handed, she picked up the hair from some wine-skins hanging in the street. Her mistress was taken in by its flaxen colour; the sorcery worked its effect, and the wine-skins, animated with a transient vitality, presented themselves at her door instead of the youth.

And now the opportunity for which he was waiting arrived, when he was admitted by Fotis to see Pamphile transform herself into an owl, and fly to her lover. The sight excited his desire to follow, and at length Fotis, yielding to his entreaties, produced a box of ointment from her mistress's cabinet. Lucius shall describe the scene himself.

‘Elated at the sight of the precious treasure, I kissed the box several times; and, uttering repeated aspirations in hopes of a prosperous flight, I stripped off all my clothes as quick as possible, dipped my fingers greedily into the box; and having thence extracted a good large lump of ointment, rubbed it all over my body and limbs. When I was thoroughly anointed, I swung my arms up and down, in imitation of the movement of a bird's pinion, and continued to do so a little while, when, instead of any perceptible token of feathers or wings making their appearance, my own skin, alas, grew into a hard leathern hide covered with bristly hair, my fingers and toes disappeared, the palms of my hands and the soles of my feet became firm solid hoofs, and from the end of my spine a long tail proceeded. My face was enormous, my mouth wide, my nostrils gaping, my lips pendulous, and I had a pair of immoderately long, rough, hairy ears. In short, when I came to contemplate my transformation to its full

extent, I found that, instead of a bird, I had become changed into an ass.'

Our readers must not expect the fairy fancy of the *Midsummer Night's Dream* in what follows.

Fotis, in her eagerness, had mistaken the box; and, though a compound of rose-leaves would have reversed the transformation, she had neglected to weave for her lover his evening chaplet, and he must take his place in the stable till they can be gathered at dawn of day. But at midnight Milo's house was sacked by a band of robbers, and long before morning Lucius, laden with the spoils of his late host, was far on the road to their cave in the mountains.

This cave is supposed to have suggested the corresponding scene in *Gil Blas*. The presiding genius — its dame Leonarda — was a crone bent double with age, and with the voice of a screech-owl, who attended upon the robbers, and received in return a rich reward of invective upon her habits and appearance. Soon another inmate arrived, a young lady whom the robbers captured in one of their raids. They handed her over to the beldame for consolation, but kind words, and harsh looks, were alike unavailing; so promising her an old wife's tale, she repeated the legend how 'celestial Cupid' —

'Holds his dear Psyche sweet entranced,  
After her wandering labours long,  
Till free consent the gods among,  
Make her his eternal bride.'

The lady listened, and was soothed; and Lucius, forgetting his transformation, regretted that he had not his pen and tablets, to note down every word. Relief, however, more substantial was at hand. The robbers had taken the resolution to slay Lucius, and sew the lady up in his hide, when a young man offered himself as a volunteer to the horde, and they were induced, from his commanding stature, his boasted achievements, and the rich prize he threw into the common stock, to take him at once as their leader. The youth was the lady's lover, and by his manœuvres soon effected her deliverance. All the inhabitants of her native city turned out to welcome her when she made her triumphal entry on the back of Lucius, and he, to testify his sympathy in the public rejoicing, made the place ring with brayings, according to his own account, as loud as thunder.

It would be tedious to follow him through his succeeding misfortunes, so we will pass to the time he spent in the service of a band of mendicant priests. He has described this passage of his life at some length.

The priests presented a fantastic appearance. Their faces

were painted, and the insides of their eyelids darkened after the manner of Eastern women. They wore white tunics striped with purple, turbans, and yellow sandals. Their arms were bare, and in their hands were large swords or axes. In this guise, they danced along in procession with a wild step to the music of flutes, cymbals, and castanets, till they arrived at the mansion of some rich proprietor, who was willing to repay a grand exhibition of their rites. Those rites were gloomy and hideous. As the band entered, they made the premises ring with discordant howlings, and ran to and fro with frantic gestures. They whirled their heads till their long hair stood out on end, and tore their flesh with their teeth and knives. Then one of the party, taking the lead, and panting deeply, pretended to be the subject of a more complete possession;—as though, says Lucius, the presence of the gods made men weak instead of strong. In a loud chaunt, he accused himself of some imaginary violation of their rules, requiring for its expiation punishment from his own hand. Seizing a whip, strung with the knucklebones of sheep,—the peculiar implement of their order,—he lashed himself severely, without betraying the least sense of pain. This exhibition continued till the earth was moistened with blood. At its close, the spectators vied in offering them money and presents of every kind, which the flagellants, well provided with wallets for the purpose, greedily scraped together and piled upon Lucius, who discharged the double function of a ‘locomotive granary and temple.’

In this way they plundered the whole neighbourhood. Once indeed, they were discovered while performing some disgraceful orgies, and compelled, for fear of public ridicule, to decamp. But no sooner had they got beyond the reach of this report, than they were again received everywhere with reverence. Nor was this feeling confined to the lower classes. On their approach to a town of considerable importance, one of the principal inhabitants, ‘a religious man and one that feared the gods greatly,’ hearing the cymbals, came out to meet them, and hospitably entertained them during their stay. At another place, they were pampered for several days at the public expense. Here they were held in high repute for their skill in divination. They were consulted on all the important emergencies of life,—the choice of a wife, the purchase of a farm, the success of a journey, or an expedition against banditti. Their fees were large, and their labour small, for they answered all comers in one formula, which the craft of the priests interpreted to suit each particular case. At length, however, their knavery was exposed. Under pretence of celebrating their secret rites, they repaired to the temple of the Mother of the



Gods, and stole thence a sacred goblet. The theft was speedily discovered; the whole band was summarily thrown into prison; and Lucius put up to auction.

He was bought by a baker, 'a kind-hearted and highly 'respectable man.' We are careful to give his character, that his establishment may not be supposed to imply monstrous inhumanity. It was one of the workhouses into which were crowded the slaves who formed the manufacturing population of the Roman world. We are not often admitted to see their interior. Profound indifference rather than any desire of concealment has caused our exclusion. Ancient writers did not care to describe what none cared to read. But this indifference had for some time been giving way. Seneca had laid down a new rule for the treatment of slaves, that a man should do to his inferiors as he would his superiors should do to him. Hadrian and Antoninus Pius took the first steps towards embodying in laws the maxims of the Stoic philosopher. The absolute jurisdiction of life and death over slaves was transferred from their masters to the prefect of the city. They were allowed to appeal to him in cases of cruelty, starvation, and gross personal affront. It is to this altered state of public feeling we probably owe the following account of Lucius's first view of the human inmates of their common abode.

'What a stunted set of human beings did I see before me! Their lacerated backs and shoulders, shaded rather than covered with ragged cloaks, were marked with black and blue wheals; some had only a slight covering round the waist, and the flesh of the rest was visible through their tatters. Their foreheads were branded with letters; their heads half shaved, their ankles in fetters, their faces of ghastly paleness, their eyes eaten away and nearly blinded by the black smoke and hot air; and they were covered with a dirty-white mixture of ashes and flour, like the dust with which wrestlers sprinkle themselves before entering the ring.'

The baker had a wife, who took an extraordinary dislike to Lucius. Before day-break, while in bed, she called out for the new ass to be harnessed to the wheel; her first act, on getting up, was to order him to be beaten; and he was the last led back to the manger. In return, he has described her character in terms of the bitterest hatred.

'The heart of that most detestable woman was like a common cess-pool, in which all the evil dispositions of our nature were collected together. There was actually no description of wickedness wanting. She was cruel, malevolent, abandoned, drunken, obstinate, close-fisted, avaricious in grasping, profuse in dissipation, an enemy to good faith, a foe to chastity. Then despising and trampling under foot the

deities, in place of the true worship, she set up a false and impious imagination of a god, whom she might style the Only God; and, deceiving her neighbours and betraying her miserable husband by the pretence of her empty observances, she abandoned herself to morning draughts of wine and unceasing adultery.'

The character may be summed up in one sentence,—the lady was a Christian. Such, at least, has been the supposition of the most learned critics. She is not indeed called by the name, but some of the features bear the closest resemblance to, and none are at variance with, the popular conception of the character. The word which expresses her creed, 'an imagination of a God' is the same which, a quarter of a century afterwards, Tertullian mentions as specifically applied by heathens to the Christian faith. The empty observances, and the morning draughts of wine recall to our minds the letter Pliny wrote to Trajan,—and the charge of impurity finds an illustration in the remark of Tertullian, that the heathen viewed the supper of the Lord with such disgust, that no man allowed his wife to go to it without a feeling of suspicion.

His next master was a gardener, who drove him every morning to the neighbouring market with a load of fresh vegetables, and on his return shared with him his evening meal of 'rancid lettuces as coarse as brooms.' While here, he had an opportunity of observing two significant instances of the insecurity of life and property at a distance from the centre of government.

There was a cottager whose small farm adjoined the domains of a youthful and rich proprietor, who employed his family influence, and his position at the head of his party, to lord it over the city. He made open war upon his poor neighbour, killed his sheep, drove away his oxen, and trampled down his growing corn. After robbing him of the fruits of his industry, he became eager to eject him from his field, and upon some pettifogging quibble, laid claim to the whole property. The cottager anxious to ~~make~~ enough of his patrimony for a grave, called together a ~~large~~ party of his fellow citizens to beat his bounds. They expostulated in the mildest terms with the great man, but were answered with threats. A voice then exclaimed that it was vain for him to play the tyrant because of his wealth, for the law gave protection to the poor against the insolence of the rich. The words fell like oil upon fire. The tyrant maddened bade his shepherds let slip their dogs, and hark them on to the attack. The faster the party fled, the more keenly the hounds pursued, and many were torn in pieces. In the end, however, some satisfaction is made to our sense of

justice. The aggressor himself fell. We are not told what became of the cottager.

But the tyranny of the wealthy was not the only species of oppression to which the poor in the provinces were exposed. The military quartered in the district treated the inhabitants with despotic insolence, and hardy indeed was the civilian, who, with justice on his side, dared to contend against a soldier. It is the history of all governments, which depend for their maintenance on the army. As the gardener was riding home on Lucius, musing over the occurrence just related, he was awakened from his reverie by a gaunt legionary demanding the ass for the use of his commanding officer, and enforcing the demand with a blow. The gardener wiped away the blood which streamed from his head, and mildly begged him to spare so sluggish and unsafe an animal. But the soldier was inexorable, and was on the point of ending the controversy by dashing out the brains of the civilian, when the gardener, by a feint, tripped him up, and pommeling him soundly, left him for dead. He seized his sword, and rode off with it at full speed to hide himself till the affair blew over. The soldier slunk to barracks, ashamed and afraid; for by the Roman articles of war, the soldier who parted with his sword was to be treated as a deserter. His comrades took up his cause, and laid an information against the gardener, for refusing to give up a silver dish, the property of their commanding officer, which, they alleged, he had found. With their help, the magistrates discovered his hiding-place, and threw him into prison to answer the charge; and there being no one now to object, the soldier took possession of Lucius.

We are fast approaching the end of his wanderings. He passed into the hands of a rich Corinthian, who being anxious to signalise his accession to office by an exhibition of more than usual magnificence, had come to Thessaly to collect wild beasts and gladiators. To his surprise, he discovered in Lucius the power of living upon human food, and, in consequence, determined upon assigning him a part in the spectacle. What that part was, we must pass over in silence. On any supposition, — whether these chapters contain an account of an actual occurrence, or are merely a caricature, — the fact, that a man of high character should write, and hearers listen to them, is evidence of depravity, we might have disbelieved, had it not been corroborated by pictures and pieces of sculpture still remaining. The exhibition opened with a ballet. Change the close atmosphere of a modern opera house for a spacious amphitheatre open to the sky — the glare of gas lamps for the bright light of a spring morning, — and we can have no difficulty in picturing to our-

selves the 'Judgment of Paris,' as it was represented that day at Corinth. The mazy dance of the corps of ballet girls, the scenery, the pantomime, — in a word, the whole representation might be modern, except that public opinion in Corinth allowed a nearer approach to the costume in which the goddesses appeared on Mount Ida, than would be tolerated now-a-days, even in *poses plastiques*.

The slaves who had the charge of Lucius were so engrossed with the spectacle, that they left him to his own devices. He took advantage of the opportunity to escape, and galloping away to the neighbouring town of Cenchreæ, laid himself down to sleep in a retired spot on the sea-shore. When he awoke, the Moon was just rising above the waves. He prayed to her as the Queen of Heaven, to save him from his debased condition, and restore him to his former self. In answer to his prayer, Isis appeared, — revealing herself as the one deity worshipped under many names, and bidding him wait till the morrow for deliverance. In return, she demanded that he should consider the remainder of life pledged to her service, to be spent in diligent obedience, devout ministrations, and inviolable purity.

In the morning, the streets of Cenchreæ were filled with crowds running hither and thither, preparing to celebrate the festival of Isis. Its contrast with the gloomy rites we witnessed just now is too marked not to be intentional. *Their* dismal howlings told of sin and expiation, the song of *this* is of mercy and thankfulness. *They* were sullied with hypocrisy and crime, *this* is all joy and purity. Even the objects of nature are supposed to sympathise in the rejoicings of the day. The ceremonial is minutely described. In front, were humorous representations of the different pursuits of mankind. There was the hunter, the soldier, the gladiator, the magistrate, the philosopher, the fowler, the fisherman, each with the emblems of his craft. There were also animals, connected by mythological fancy with the worship of Isis. A tame bear sat in a car, in the garb of a matron: the part of Ganymede was performed by an ape; and an ass, with a pair of wings glued to his back in imitation of Pegasus, walked beside a Bellerophon in the person of a decrepid old man. Next came the procession. A troop of women preceded the image of the goddess, carrying mirrors on their shoulders, to reflect her figure. Some with ivory combs imitated the action of dressing her hair, others sprinkled perfumes along the path, or brandished torches. They marched to the chant of a chorus, with an accompaniment of flutes and cymbals. Then followed the main-body of the initiated, — a crowd of men and women of all ranks and ages, dressed in white linen. The men had their heads shaved.

Priests of tall stature carried the sacred vessels,—a golden lamp like a boat, a palm tree, an altar, a model of the left hand, to signify fair dealing, and a winnowing-fan. Next were borne aloft the emblems of the gods — the dog Anubis, with his faces half sable, half gold,—a cow, the type of production,—an ark, and lastly, an object in the likeness neither of beast, nor bird, nor even human being; a small urn, covered with hieroglyphics, with a handle of the shape of an asp,—the peculiar symbol of the goddess. The high-priest closed the train, and, forewarned in a dream, paused at the approach of Lucius, to offer him his garland. He tasted, and the promise of the deity was fulfilled. The transformation was reversed. His neck, his ears, his teeth, re-assumed their human dimensions, and his tail, the feature in his asinine incarnation most galling, completely vanished. The priest explained to him the events of his life. In youth, notwithstanding the advantages of birth, social position, and learning, he had given way to debasing pleasures and ill-fated curiosity. But the punishment which the blindness of Fortune had inflicted, had brought him to a better mind. Calamity had no hold over those whose lives the goddess claimed for herself. 'Let the unhallowed behold, let them behold and acknowledge their error. Lo, delivered from his former woes by the providence of the mighty Isis, Lucius has triumphed over his destiny. Still, to be more secure, enlist in our sacred army. Devote thyself from this hour to the observance of our ritual, and freely take the yoke of its service: for when thou hast begun to serve the goddess, thou wilt more truly enjoy liberty.'

When the rites of the day were celebrated, and the mimic ship sacred to Isis had been launched, to secure a prosperous navigation for the season, the crowd dispersed to spread abroad the fame of the miracle, and Lucius prepared to obey the monition of the goddess. A sense of religious awe delayed awhile his initiation. The ritual was difficult of observance. It ordained a severe rule of abstinence, and a life of the utmost circumspection. The high-priest, too, checked his impatience, representing the impiety of haste as no less than that of disobedience to the call. At length, however, the will of the goddess was clearly revealed, and he was admitted to initiation. He was bathed and sprinkled with pure water. Ten days of fasting were then prescribed. On the evening of the tenth day, the people flocked from all directions, according to ancient custom, to present him with their offerings. Presently the profane were ordered to withdraw, and the priest led him into the innermost sanctuary. We will hear from himself what he saw.

'I approached the abode of death; with my foot I pressed the threshold of Proserpine's palace. I was transported through the elements, and conducted back again. At midnight I saw the bright light of the sun shining. I stood in the presence of the gods,—the gods of heaven and of the shades below; aye, stood near and worshipped. And now have I only told thee such things, that, hearing, thou necessarily canst not understand; and, being beyond the comprehension of the profane, I can enunciate without committing a crime.'

In the morning the people were again admitted to see him, placed like a statue in the middle of the temple, in a linen robe embroidered with hieroglyphics, and a crown of palm leaves. This was his spiritual birth-day, and was spent in festivity and social intercourse. On the third day the same rites were repeated, and the initiation was then complete. Though Lucius has told us that it is beyond our comprehension, there can be little doubt but that the ceremony typified death and a resurrection.

After this he went to Rome, and was there initiated into the mysteries of Osiris, which differed widely from those of Isis, in the mode of their celebration, though the two deities were closely connected, or, more properly speaking, substantially one. Osiris revealed to him that he should become famous for his forensic success; and to distinguish him from the great body of his sacred profession, appointed him to a high office among the *Pastophori*, an order whose duty it was to bear the pall in the processions of the god.

'Thenceforward,' says Lucius, 'I fulfilled my duty as a member of that ancient college; and, with a head newly and thoroughly shaved, joyfully exposed my bald pate to the gaze of the multitude whithersoever I went.'

Such is the outline of a story which acquired considerable popularity from the middle of the second to the fourth century. Its interest was increased by a curious theological discussion. When in their controversies with their heathen neighbours, the early Christians appealed for confirmation to the miracles of our Lord, they were met by a counter-appeal to current accounts of wonders performed by reputed magicians. Apuleius was ranked in this class, and the metamorphoses of Lucius, under which name he was supposed to represent himself, were quoted among his miracles. Lactantius and Jerome in the third century both allude to the dispute. At a later period Marcellinus applied to his father for an answer. The answer is remarkable. Apuleius has himself denied any knowledge of magic; and Augustin was obviously inclined to give credit to

the denial, though he was staggered by the universality of the rumour, and from feeling that those who started the difficulty would not appreciate so simple a solution. Adopting therefore the popular version, he contrasted him with David. Born in the higher ranks, highly educated and of great eloquence, he never with all his arts succeeded in obtaining any judicial office in the republic. And yet his actions showed that he was not insensible to ambition. He did his best, and his failure was due to want of power, not of will. David, on the contrary, not by magic, but by pleasing God, rose from a shepherd to a king. Without much astuteness, the heathen opponent might have replied that Apuleius was not really ambitious. He retired early in life from Rome to his native place Madaura, and there reached the highest judicial post a colony had to offer. He speaks with pride of succeeding to his father's office, and it is a fair conclusion that his ambition looked no higher. Be this as it may, the answer seems to have proved good as an *argumentum ad homines*, for we hear no more of the question.

But we should wrong Augustin were we to suppose his 'strong, capacious, and argumentative mind' could rest satisfied with this solution. In his work 'On the City of God,' he has attempted to account for the phenomenon consistently with philosophy and religion. If true, it must be attributed to the agency of demons, beings to whom the power of creation, or of effecting real transformations, is denied by God, and the power of producing deceptive appearances alone conceded. Through some inexplicable exercise of that power, the phantasy of one man, that part of us which, though itself incorporeal, assumes with strange rapidity in thought, or sleep, a thousand corporeal shapes, is made to appear to another in the form of an animal; in such a manner that, while the one, far removed and buried in deep sleep, imagines himself an animal carrying a load, the other sees, not a real animal, but the appearance of an animal, carrying a load, which, if real, is carried by the unseen demon. Our first impulse is to laugh, but Augustin had to explain the evidence of persons who testified to having heard of, and actually seen, such transformations. The controversy has left no trace, except that of compelling each succeeding editor to examine the proof of identity between Apuleius and his hero. The earlier commentators are nearly equally divided on the subject. Sir George Head says, 'Unquestionably,' from the beginning to the end of the 'adventures of his hero Lucius, it was himself whom 'he intended to personate;' while nearly all modern scholars of authority take a different view. This last is our opinion. If

we except, perhaps, the scene describing the initiation, they have apparently no more in common than any other novelist of manners and his hero; though much that the hero relates must most probably consist of the experience of the novelist.

Apuleius hated magic, because it had exercised a real and unpleasant influence upon his life. While studying at Athens, he became intimate with a young man, Pontianus, an African like himself. Pontianus's mother, Pudentilla, was a rich lady of forty, who had remained in widowhood thirteen years, for the sake of her sons. That reason no longer applied; and now her own inclination prompted, her family advised, and her physicians prescribed, matrimony. Pontianus fixed upon Apuleius as worthy of being his mother's husband and his own stepfather; and he proceeded in the matter like an adept in match-making. Apuleius happened to be visiting at Cea, the modern Tripoli, where Pudentilla lived, on his way to Alexandria. Pontianus sounded him on the subject of marriage, and seeing his unwillingness, entreated him not to risk his health by travelling that winter, but to wait till next year, when he would himself accompany him,—begging him meanwhile to remain in their house, which was healthy, and commanded a view of the sea. Apuleius acquiesced, and common studies cemented his friendship with the lady. The favourable moment at length arrived; when after the delivery by Apuleius of a very successful public lecture, Pontianus told him that the whole of Cea agreed he would make an excellent husband for Pudentilla. She was, he admitted, a widow without personal attractions; adding, with a shrewd knowledge of his friend's weaknesses, that to reserve himself in hope of a match for beauty or money, was unbecoming a friend and a philosopher. His wish to travel was the difficulty; but soon he became as eager to win the lady, as if he had made the offer. Now her connexions began to object. Pontianus was gained over to their faction, and every obstacle was placed in the way of the lovers,—of course without success. The opposition, nevertheless, did not cease even upon the marriage. They prosecuted him in the Court of the Proconsul for dealing in magic, and so obtaining the lady's affections. Every topic, however irrelevant and absurd, which could make him ludicrous or unpopular, was foisted in to eke out the ridiculous charge; and it is to his Apology that we owe our knowledge of his personal history. He was handsome;—so had other philosophers been, but literary labour had worn away his good looks, and his neglected locks hung down in ropes: he used tooth-powder,—the habit was cleanly and not unphilosophical: he wrote love-sonnets,—his verses might be wanton, but his life was pure: he carried a looking-glass,—he



was studying the laws of reflection: he was poor,—he had spent his patrimony in assisting his friends and in travelling: he collected fishes for the purposes of magic,—he was investigating their natural history, and trying to use them in medicine: a boy had suddenly fallen in his presence,—the boy had a fit: a lady of sixty had been charmed into marrying a man half her age,—he told the story, the lady was only forty; her relations had got up the prosecution from jealousy at his obtaining her property, and meanwhile he had induced the reluctant Pudentilla to leave her money to her son. The defence was complete; we need not add, he was acquitted.

Critics have perplexed themselves to find a hidden meaning in the book. They have supposed it an allegory, representing the soul invited by Virtue and Vice;—like the old story of the Choice of Hercules. Thus Byrrhæna is Virtue, warning Lucius against Pamphile and Fotis, the impersonation of Vice; but led astray by curiosity and love of pleasure, he neglects the warning, and his transformation typifies his fall into sensuality. In the end, his better nature,—the human reason beneath the asinine form,—roused and strengthened by misfortune, becomes victorious, and induces him to pledge himself to Virtue by initiation among the worshippers of Isis. Warburton has lent his support to this theory. His ingenuity has tempted him to carry it a step further. He exalts Apuleius into a controversialist, and an inveterate enemy of Christianity; and he considers the true design of the story to be ‘to recommend Initiation into the Mysteries, in opposition to the ‘New Religion.’ This interpretation is founded on the character of the baker’s wife, and a passage in the Apology, from which Warburton concludes that his accuser was a Christian. For the honour of the African Church, we hope the conclusion is false; and assuredly, if Apuleius had intended to single out Christianity for his attack, he would have made his meaning clearer. Nor do we think the tale an allegory. It was not new; we have it in Lucian, and both are said to have copied from an earlier writer—Lucius of Patrae.

But Apuleius introduced two remarkable additions,—the account of the Mysteries, and an allegory, closely connected with them, representing the fall, the trials, and the ultimate restoration of the soul to the love of what is divine,—the legend of Cupid and Psyche. In the Greek account Lucius regains his human form on merely tasting rose-leaves; Apuleius, by his version, obviously intended to use the old story as a vehicle for a panegyric on the ‘Mysteries.’ The advantage of initiation was an established tenet of the philosophy of the day, and in

his *Apology* he boasts of having studied 'many sacred systems, 'rites, and ceremonies, in the pursuit of truth and the exercise 'of piety.' Now, by the side of the true mysteries had grown up a race of impostors, who brought discredit upon them by their debauchery, magic, and lying divinations. To this race belonged the priests of the Syrian Goddess, with their bloody rites. To this the Jewish fortuneteller, who appears in *Juvénal*, between the howling priests of *Osiris* and the Armenian soothsayer. To this, in common apprehension, the Christian. Like the heathen mysteries, the Christian Society was proselyting and migratory. Still more, like them, it was part of the dregs which the Syrian *Orontes* rolled into the *Tiber*. No more was needed to arouse prejudice, and render inquiry unnecessary, on the part of a Roman. Every fact and every report was made to harmonise with this theory of its character, and hence come the features in the baker's wife which we can recognise, combined with others to which we know of no counterpart. Against all these superstitions *Apuleius* levelled his satire. They were gloomy and infernal; nay, more, they were caricatures of the truth. His object was to bring out the contrast. The best commentary on the book is his own confession of faith made on his trial:—'We, of the Platonic School, believe in 'nothing but what is joyous, cheerful, festive, from above, 'heavenly.'

One word upon his *Latinity*. Grammarians place him with *Tertullian* and *Cyprian*, in the African School, the chief peculiarity of which is an affectation of old forms of speech. Punic was the common language of the north of Africa, and *Apuleius* learnt his Latin in the schools of the rhetoricians. The rhetoricians were indebted for the important position they then occupied to the patronage of *Hadrian*; and, in return, they echoed his imperial criticism, that *Cato* ranked above *Cicero*, *Ennius* above *Virgil*. *Apuleius* caught their spirit, and in every page we have the florid declamation of a later age studded with archaisms and expressions which, even when new, are stamped to resemble an early coinage. He is not one of those authors who live by their style. As a novelist he has had his day; but to the student of the history of literature and society during the decay of the Roman Empire, he will always be a useful and amusing companion.

- ART. VII.—1. *Two Letters to the Earl of Aberdeen on the State Prosecutions of the Neapolitan Government.* By the Right Hon. W. GLADSTONE, M.P. Second Edition. London: 1851. 8vo.
2. *Al Sig. Guglielmo Gladstone, Parole di gratitudine di GIUSEPPE MASSARI, ex-Dip. al Parlamento Napolitano.* Torino: 1851. 12mo.
3. *The Neapolitan Government and Mr. Gladstone. A Letter to the Earl of Aberdeen.* By CHARLES MACFARLANE. 8vo. London: 1851.
4. *Conclusioni pronunziate innanzi alla Gran Corte speciale di Napoli, nella causa della setta l'Unità Italiana, dal Consigliere Procurator Generale Filippo Angelillo.* Napoli: 1850. 8vo.
5. *Requisizione ed Atto di Accusa . . . nella causa della setta l'Unità Italiana.* Napoli: 1850. 8vo.
6. *Decisione della Gran Corte speciale nella causa della setta l'Unità Italiana.* Napoli: 1851. 8vo.
7. *Atti e Difesa della causa di Carlo Poerio ed altri.* Napoli: 1850. 8vo.
8. *Speech of C. Poerio, late Minister of Public Instruction.* London: 1851.
9. *Difesa di Luigi Settembrini.* 1850. 8vo.
10. *Costituto di Nicola Nisco.* 1850. 8vo.
11. *Atto d' Accusa nella causa degli avvenimenti politici del 15 Maggio 1848.* Napoli: 1851. 8vo.
12. *Eccezione d'incompetenza dedotta dall' Avvocato Lorenzo Jacovelli imputato dei fatti del 15 Maggio 1848.* Napoli: 1851. 8vo.
13. *Coup d'œil sur la situation de la Sicile en 1847, et sur la marche de sa Révolution.* Par P. C. O'RAREDON. Gênevè: Cherbuliez, 1850. 8vo.
14. *Young Italy.* By A. B. COCHRANE, M.P. London: 1850. 8vo.

THE history of the rise and fall of the national cause in Italy is before our readers: the result of those events remains to be told; and this is the task which we propose to ourselves on the present occasion. The extent of the subject will prevent us from exhausting it; and had we consulted our feelings only, we should have gladly abstained from the painful task of exposing to the world transactions which men of all parties must

learn with the deepest emotion. But we consider it to be a duty which we owe to truth and to justice, to lay bare, at whatever cost to our feelings, the iniquities perpetrated in the name of legitimate government and of religion by a set of persons, who, after having crouched before the popular enthusiasm when triumphant, now abuse their, we trust, temporary success, without respect for either divine or human laws, of which forsooth they call themselves the assertors and avengers. We apply these expressions more particularly to the Government of Naples. We say to the *Government*, wishing to keep the Sovereign out of sight; not that we mean to act the part of apologists of His Sicilian Majesty, but because, however bad he might be, he could not carry out his principles, did he not find in his government and supporters, not only a ready compliance with his wishes, but individuals, who, taking advantage of his weakness, urge him on to cruelty by deceiving him. Better surrounded, and more honestly advised, this Prince might, if such be his nature, be still inclined to acts of tyranny and injustice; but this inclination would be checked, if not altogether neutralised. At present, he is, perhaps, held responsible for more than he ought in fairness to bear.\*

The oppression under which the Italians have long been suffering has always been well known. It has, however, been held to be exaggerated in some particulars. Englishmen, who are so justly disposed to laugh at foreigners, when they attempt to give an account of our laws, institutions, and government, think themselves quite competent to decide on such matters in other countries; the course which they generally pursue is to argue from what they do know of the subject in their own country, to what they do not know of it in foreign States, drawing the most erroneous conclusions. When an Englishman, accustomed to impartial and independent judges—to fair and uniform proceedings—to deliberate and solemn judgments,—hears of persons tried and condemned abroad, he never dreams that the trial is other than what it is in England, where the judgment is the obvious result of the judicial inquiry. Not doubting the perfect straight-forwardness of what takes

---

\* We have just learnt, with great satisfaction, that His Sicilian Majesty, on being informed of one of the points much dwelt upon by Mr. Gladstone in his First Letter, has directed an inquiry into the state of the Neapolitan prisons. We may thence fairly infer that, had his ministers laid the case before His Majesty long ago, as they were bound to do, an inquiry would have been ordered at once, instead of being delayed till a foreigner urged it on.

place in England, no Englishman is ever inclined to listen to doubts thrown on what takes place elsewhere. There is, after all, much in a name: because English judges are venerable, all those who are called judges in other countries must be 'venerable' likewise;—because the law is justly administered in England, the administration of the law must be just in other countries;—because no sensible man will listen to the protestations of innocence by a convict in England, therefore no one ought to listen to such protestations in foreign countries. It has been in vain that the most convincing proofs have been produced of the injustice of foreign sentences, of the dishonesty of foreign judges, of the unfairness of foreign trials. Englishmen would not entertain the question; and the innocent victims of the most infamous systems of administration of *injustice* have died a lingering death, their memory insulted if not forgotten; not seldom the object of coarse jests and unmanly allusions, in a country which boasts of the generosity of its Conservatives, and of the pure Christianity of all its classes.

The recent Neapolitan victims would have met with the same fate, had not Providence inspired a gentleman of unblemished character, brilliant talents, high position, uniting to the qualifications which eminently fitted him for discovering the truth a heart that urged him on to search for it, and a will which was not to be baffled in its pursuit. We need not say of whom we speak. Mr. Gladstone went to Naples soon after having voted against the Government on a vital question of foreign policy. Secretary of State for the Colonies in that Administration which had Lord Aberdeen for Foreign Secretary, Mr. Gladstone would have been too happy to be able to say that the Conservative Government of Naples deserved the respect and support of the great and influential party in this country, of which he is an ornament and a leading member. But Mr. Gladstone is not one of those who attach much importance to a name; and having soon had reason to suspect that under the cloak of Conservatives and Conservatism may be concealed persons whose wickedness it is a duty to expose, and principles which every honest man must repudiate, he determined to inquire into the facts and to get at the truth. The result of his inquiries has been recorded in his two Letters to Lord Aberdeen. That the correctness of this result must have been reluctantly admitted by a politician of Mr. Gladstone's party need hardly be mentioned; that as a gentleman and a Christian Mr. Gladstone must have hesitated at believing, until further doubt, and disbelief became impossible, we may well suppose; if even he had not expressly declared, that he expects

that his statements should be received in the first instance with incredulity, and that he had himself felt that incredulity, but that it has yielded to conviction step by step. (P. 41.)

Guided by his own heart,—the heart is always in its right place in a gentleman, as was said by the knight who refused to commit an unworthy act, which, it was urged, would remain a secret,—Mr. Gladstone determined on endeavouring to mitigate the horrors which he had witnessed, and to expose the infamies which he had discovered, no matter at what sacrifice. We confess we envy his party a man, whose talents we have often admired, but whose generosity of feeling had not been sufficiently appreciated; and, far from grudging him the universal approbation with which his noble vindication of the rights of humanity has been greeted, we cannot avoid muttering to ourselves,—*Cum talis sis, utinam noster esses!*

Although there have been now and then whispers of disapprobation, such as, What are the sufferings of some Neapolitans to Mr. Gladstone? Mr. Gladstone's resolution in publishing what he saw has been generally applauded. Would any man stand by without expressing his horror, were a child murdered under his eyes?—and, yet, what is that to him? Had the case been one of illegality only,—had there been no other charge against the Government of Naples, than that every day and in every act of its existence it violates the fundamental law of the land,—that law which the King, in the most awful and solemn manner, spontaneously swore to maintain, on his word as a king, and on his soul as a Christian,—there might have been some excuse on the part of Mr. Gladstone if, out of respect to a political line of conduct, which we freely admit to be very often the least objectionable to follow, he had repressed his private feelings as an Englishman. But this illegality—gross, flagrant, and universal as it is,—becomes totally insignificant in comparison with the other features of the case,—features which convert every man who feels for his fellow-creatures as Christians ought, into an avenger of outraged humanity, and give him a mission to expose, if he cannot otherwise amend, a gigantic iniquity, such as has rarely in the history of man trampled upon earth, or lifted its audacious front to heaven.

There is a bond of flesh that unites man to man,—there is a community of nature and of lot, of thought and feeling, of hope and aspiration, of weakness, of sorrow, of suffering, which under certain circumstances compels us with a power paramount to that of ordinary rules of conduct,—framed upon the supposition of an average standard of behaviour among

men,—to act in an exceptional manner. The present,—we confidently appeal to those who have any knowledge of the facts,—is one of those anomalous cases for which no ordinary rule can provide, and which is, therefore, to be decided on its special merits.

In his admirable Letters Mr. Gladstone has been particularly careful—perhaps too much so—to guard himself from being supposed to mix up the question of the illegality of the Government, with the means which that Government adopts to support it. The Neapolitan Government is struggling to protect its utter illegality by a tyranny unparalleled at this moment in any part of the globe, and scarcely with a rival in the annals of older atrocities. To say ‘unparalleled at this moment’ is saying little. That might be true were it in point of cruelty, corruption and iniquity, only a little more than *primus inter pares*. But it is much more. It is a Government which stands in a class and constitutes a *genus* by itself; it surpasses by a considerable distance any other well-ascertained case even of Italian tyranny. It purchases perjury by bribery in all ranks,—in its police agents, in its witnesses, in its instruments of execution, whom it dignifies with the name of judges. It views the use of these means as sanctified by the end, which end is rank murder—murder carried into effect by the application of the slowest refinement of misery in the persons of their unhappy victims, and veiled under the mask of hypocrisy. It perpetrates these enormities upon such a scale, that whole classes are included under its fell swoop. Above all, and as a whole, that class is most persecuted which constitutes the real vitality of a nation—the middle class in its widest acceptation, but particularly in its upper portion which embraces the professions,—the most cultivated and most progressive part of the nation. Let the heartless and pedantic politicians of the selfish school consider these facts; not feeling in themselves the courage to imitate Mr. Gladstone, they may well envy him that success, from which they in vain try to detract by their craven scruples; *Virtutem videant intabescantque relictâ.*

We are told that a few of the political friends of Mr. Gladstone have not been overpleased that a man filling so prominent a political position should have done what, as a party man, he ought, in their opinion, to have avoided. We think, on the contrary, that the party to which Mr. Gladstone belongs will benefit from his noble efforts in favour of the oppressed and persecuted; and were we of a different opinion, we should be still more disposed to admire Mr. Gladstone’s manly conduct. Political principles, moreover, are not the worse for being seasoned with a

*souçon* of humanity. We are not sure that Mr. Gladstone has not sacrificed too much to his position as a statesman in forbearing from unfolding the foul case against the Neapolitan Government in that assembly of gentlemen where his words are always received with profound attention, and where generous sentiments are certain to find sympathy. Whatever may be thought of Mr. Gladstone's reserve in this respect, of this we are satisfied, that nothing could be more considerate than his proceedings towards a party which, *volens nolens*, he feels to have something in common with his. Before exposing to the public atrocities the unveiling of which must make even a Neapolitan Government shake — *trepidant immisso lumine Manes* — Mr. Gladstone addressed his First Letter, privately, to Lord Aberdeen, disclosing important facts, in the hope that, being made known in the proper quarter through so influential a channel as his Lordship, some remedy might be applied.

‘But,’ says Mr. Gladstone in his Second Letter, ‘the manner in which it [the First Letter] had been received in the quarter directly affected by my allegations, had entirely convinced me that it would not be warrantable to trust any longer, in this case, to the mere force of expostulation, before, driven from the definite hopes which I had founded upon your assistance, I committed my First Letter to the press.’

Here we pause merely to remark, in justice to the King of Naples, that we have good ground for affirming that he never saw Mr. Gladstone's First Letter before it was printed, although it was intended that he should do so. Whether he has seen it even now, is more than we can say; and that he may not even now know all the iniquities which Mr. Gladstone with so much precision and moderation relates, is very probable; for since his ministers, treating His Majesty as a cipher and a mere tool in their hands, took it upon themselves to keep from him the *whole* truth, as we know, we may very well doubt whether even a part was ever communicated to His Sicilian Majesty. The character of the facts disclosed by Mr. Gladstone is by this time well known over all the civilised world in which — republican France, of course, its foreign legations and the agents of the Neapolitan Police excepted — not a voice has been raised to palliate them. In England, where the letters of Mr. Gladstone are circulating by thousands, it is hardly necessary to do more than allude to them.

Although the guilt or innocence of the gentlemen now dying a lingering death in the Neapolitan dungeons does not in the least affect the value of Mr. Gladstone's disclosures, we think, nevertheless, that it is desirable, particularly with



the view of giving an insight into the nature and working of the Neapolitan Government, to relate the history of one or two of the crimes imputed to the persons now suffering as guilty of them. The deeds which we shall have to record would seem to proceed from a government bent only upon destroying the fundamental truths of religion and morality, in order to substitute for them falsehood, thirst for blood, the gratification of all the meanest and most degrading passions, and relying only on brute force for securing their triumph — the triumph of vice in its most revolting nakedness — the oppression of virtue in its noblest form; in short, adopting the phrase which Mr. Gladstone quotes, the negation of God reduced to a system.

Poerio, Settembrini, Agresti, Faucitano, Romeo, Pironti, Nisco, and all those of whom Mr. Gladstone speaks in his Letters, were accused of belonging to a secret Society called *l'Unità Italiana*. Now we have looked very carefully over all the documents to which we could possibly obtain access, but we have not found any proof of the existence of such a society which would justify one of our magistrates in committing a prisoner. We will rest on the authority of the prosecutor to show how rotten is the whole case. The speech of this public officer contains extracts from documents which, it is contended, prove the existence of the Society; but besides that they are only extracts, their authenticity is far from proved. And when a Government, its courts of law, and its police are capable of forging documents, as we shall show to have been the case at Naples, we are at liberty to more than doubt the authenticity of what purports to be the statutes and blank diplomas of the Society *l'Unità Italiana*. But, what is more, no proof has been offered by the public accuser that the persons accused ever saw the statutes in question, or that the Society, to which they were charged to belong, was the same with that to which the statutes and diplomas referred.

From the same speech of the public accuser, we shall extract some specimens of judicial logic, judicial fairness, and judicial evidence; from them, better than from any comment, the absurdity of the charges and the iniquity of the judgment may be inferred. One of the accusations was, that the members of *l'Unità Italiana* were conspiring to establish a republic, and that Nicola Nisco, one of the alleged directors of the Society, was very eager to enlist partisans in this cause. As a proof of this, the public accuser states that sundry captains of the National Guard in the *Principato Ulteriore*

‘Listened to the perfidious insinuations of Nisco, and that the most criminal correspondence by letters, of which Nicola Riano and

Crescenzo Petrillo were the bearers, was carried on between the conspirators. I cannot lay before you,' says the worthy Angelillo, 'the mad words which were used in that correspondence, because the several letters having remained in the hands of the conspirators, they have escaped the judicial researches. But the object of that correspondence was too well shown by the incautious conduct of the captain of the National Guard of Montefredino, and of some of his dependents, who, after having read one of those letters, which, at Nisco's request, was taken to them by Crescenzo Petrillo, in April, 1848, in this man's presence, overcome by an irresistible enthusiasm, each of them broke out in the elegant exclamation: "Then, by heaven! we must proclaim the Republic!" And this is, moreover, proved by the Captain of Solofra, who, on receiving a similar letter, strongly urged the bearer of it to conceal in future such letters about his person near the skin, to avoid getting into trouble. From these exhortations, even that uneducated and half-witted man argued that the object of that correspondence was to collect forces and to proclaim the Republic. In the same manner and for the same purpose Nisco held a correspondence with the districts of Montesarchio and of Cervinara, and also with the city of Benevento; and his correspondents there were Joseph de Ferrariis, Frederic Verna, Salvator Sebariani, persons of the same party, and well known for destructive intentions.\* And we may well believe that these persons were not idle, for Sebariani, more daring than the others, attempted a revolt at Benevento; but not succeeding, he was sent to prison.' (*Angelillo*, pp. 17, 18.)

And the Court, worthy of such an Attorney-General, quotes in its judgment against Nisco such *proofs* as these, almost word for word; only adding that at the trial the faithful messenger Petrillo 'explained' that the unanimous exclamation of the Captain of Montefredino and his friends about the proclamation of the Republic, were uttered in this manner: 'Nisco wishes to be elected deputy, and we will have the Republic,'—an 'explanation' utterly unintelligible, and making darker what was before incredible. Comments are superfluous; only we beg to observe, that at pages 25. and 55. of these same precious 'Conclusions,' the guilt of Nisco is argued from his having been a candidate for the place of Deputy to Parliament for his own native province.

Another specimen of evidence worth notice, is that of a person of the name of Margherita, who, being himself accused, endeavoured, but unsuccessfully, to escape a severe punishment by calumniating, clumsily in most cases, his co-accused. The

---

\* It is necessary to note that Benevento belongs not to the kingdom of Naples, but to the Papal States.

reason why he has been so severely punished, notwithstanding his calumnies, is, that when re-examined (submitted to what is called the *Costituto*, on which occasion the person under examination has a right to say what he thinks proper in his defence), he completely retracted what he had said at first, and stated that he had said it in consequence 'of the threats, the preparations for torture, the allurements, and the promises made to him by the judge by whom he had been at first examined' (the *Istruttore*, or *Juge Instructeur*, as the French call such a being). (*Settembrini*, p. 32.) On being asked what was the object of the Society, Margherita naïvely answers: 'I do not know; but from what Sessa and Giordano said, the end of it was to support the constitution which the Government wanted to suppress!!' Margherita at first, that is, previous to his *Costituto*, had stated, with respect to the existence of the secret Society l'Unità Italiana, 'that in September, 1848, he had confidentially learnt from Giordano and Sessa that there existed a central committee, of which Agresti was chairman, and Poerio, Carafa, Pironti, Persico, and Settembrini, with others unknown to him, were members; and that Settembrini was secretary, and Persico was treasurer.' (*Conclusioni*, p. 80.) Unluckily for the police, in the statutes of that Society, as laid before the Court by the prosecution, there were no such dignitaries as chairman, secretary, and treasurer. Thereupon Angelillo, nothing daunted, remarks:—

'True, that in the Statutes there is no mention of a *Central Committee*, there is, however, that of a *Council* placed over the inferior circles; and this, as the concentric point towards which converged all the acts of the provincial circles, was well designated, from its functions, by the name of *Central Committee*. Although there is no mention of *treasurer*, mention is made of *quæstor*, which is an equivalent office; and if there is no office of *secretary*, there is, nevertheless, that of *master*. In that change of names which has given rise to such a display of noisy arguments, I do not, therefore, see any thing else but the material necessity of the Society of adapting its phraseology to common understandings, to which those names more expressive, indeed, but more classical and more difficult, might have appeared too unusual and abstruse.' (*Angelillo*, p. 84.)

So that, according to the learned Angelillo, the words *consiglio* and *maestro* are unusual and abstruse words for the generality of Italians!

There is a story put into the mouth of poor Margherita to the following effect:—

'That in June or July of the same year (i.e. 1849), and after Pironti's imprisonment, he (Margherita) learnt from the aforesaid

Giordano and Sessa that a Committee of Murderers\* had been instituted, in order to take the life of the most excellent Minister the Chevalier Longobardi, of the excellent Prefect of Police, the Commander Peccheneda, and of the honourable Magistrate who presides over this illustrious body (i.e. the Court); which project being submitted to the opinions of Agresti, Settembrini, and Pironti, in the prisons of Sta Maria Apparente, by means of letters taken to them by Lorenzo Vellucci and Francesco Antonetti †, it received their approbation; and Giordano and Sessa, in order to carry it out, asked Margherita to find a safe person, for which purpose they furnished him with some fire-arms.' (*Angelillo*, p. 82.)

Our readers, however slightly versed in the history of the *Reign of Terror* during the French Revolution, will not forget that one of the most clumsy pretexts of the revolutionary tribunals, and of the Committee of Public Safety, for shedding blood, was that known under the name of the 'Conspiracy des Prisons.' For the very same sanguinary purpose is the identical absurd pretext alleged by the pious, mild, and merciful police of the most pious, most mild, and most merciful Neapolitan Government; a coincidence which we think worthy of note. This time, however, the Neapolitan police overreached itself. Pironti was arrested on the 3rd of August, 1849, and Margherita, as well as Giordano, had been arrested before him; therefore the latter could not have heard what they said they had, nor could Pironti have received in prison letters which, as the story ran, must have been sent before he was there.

'Oh!' says the sturdy Angelillo, 'these are mere trifles: the Committee of Murderers was not a recent invention of the conspirators; it was as old as January, 1849; for the murder of several ministers, of the Commissary of Police, Merenda, and of Captain Palmieri, was then determined upon. The newly intended assassinations were, therefore, only a second proposition of the Society; and it may well have happened in June or July, 1849, as Margherita states. If, however, the arrest of Pironti, having happened in August, could in any manner disturb the mind of the judges about the chronology of the events, the Court will not certainly forget that Margherita repeated only what he heard from Giordano; that he had no reports with Pironti, except through Sessa and Giordano; that Margherita might well, either through forgetfulness or confusion of ideas, think, when making his disclosures, that Pironti was at the time already arrested, when he was not so in fact.' (*Angelillo*, pp. 85, 86.)

---

\* The word is *pugnatori*; that is, literally, *daggerers*.

† Vellucci and Antonetti, who said as much as they dared to please the Government, declared, nevertheless, that they had never taken letters, or had ever even been in Sta Maria Apparente. (*Settembrini*, p. 32.)

Such logic soars to so high a degree of impudence that it is impossible for plain honest folks to follow it. It would be shocking to hear such arguments used any where; but to learn that they have been used by an officer of justice, and not only listened to but acted upon, by a court of law, is an enormity which makes one shudder.

Having shown from the words and acts of the prosecutor upon what principles these criminal prosecutions were carried on, we shall now select a few circumstances only from one of the cases, and show how overwhelming was the defence, although hampered to a degree unequalled out of Italy in modern times. Mr. Gladstone has shown this in the case of Poerio; we shall show the same in the case of Settembrini, quoting his words. The fate of this victim calls forth the warmest feelings of sympathy, whilst his splendid talent, his eloquence, his powers of reasoning, his manliness, his noble character, command our admiration. Settembrini is a man worthy of the best times of Greece and Rome. The persecutions of which he has been the object, and the cruel treatment which has been inflicted upon him on more occasions than one, are, if not unparalleled, certainly unsurpassed in the history of tyranny.

Luigi Settembrini is a literary man of distinction, who, in 1839 — when not yet twenty-seven years of age — was arrested on a charge of belonging to the Giovine Italia. After twenty-six months' imprisonment he was tried and declared not guilty. He was nevertheless kept in prison for sixteen months more, and liberated after three years and a half imprisonment.\* In

---

\* We should have thought that what Settembrini suffered was sufficient punishment for his innocence, and that he ought not to suffer again on that score. But we were mistaken. Angelillo (p. 117.) assumes positively that Settembrini was guilty in 1838, and therefore argues that he must have been guilty in 1848. Against Pironti Angelillo alleged that 'the secret inquiries of the police' prove him to be a man of anarchical and destructive principles; against Poerio, that he had before been arrested (never indicted, still less tried) for high treason; against Agresti, that he was possessed of a masonic catechism; against Vellucci, that he was watched by the Commissary of Police of his district, who suspected him of being in the pay of the demagogues; against Braico, that there were secret reports in the Ministry for the Home Department, &c. &c. Moreover, Nisco had actually in his possession a printed copy of the Sicilian Constitution; Molinaro, a tricoloured handkerchief, supposed an emblem of a secret society; Esposito, a tricoloured scarf . . . . . This is overwhelming evidence, not of guilt certainly, but of perversion of logic.

March, 1848, he was appointed Under Secretary for the Department of Public Instruction, of which department Poerio was then secretary. He resigned in May of the same year, finding the occupation unsuited to a man of his habits. During the Calabrian insurrection he was requested by Poerio and other friends of the moderate party to write an address to the electors. He did so; that address was burnt at Lecce by the popular party as a servile composition. He was then offered a pension, which he felt he did not deserve, not having served for more than six weeks, and he refused it, adding, however, that he would be too happy to be employed and rewarded; he was then offered a place in the Treasury, which he declined, being conscious of his utter incompetency for the office. Without his knowledge, on the 24th of November, he was elected deputy; but his resignation of the place of Under Secretary not having yet been accepted, he himself pointed out the law which rendered the election void; the House held the objection fatal, and his seat was declared vacant. And yet this man is accused — as if it were a crime, if true — of having canvassed to be elected! Towards the end of May, 1849, he chanced to meet in the streets his friend Poerio, who informed him that one Jervolino went often to see him (Poerio) to ask assistance; that he (Poerio) had had in his hands a report of Jervolino to the police, of which he was a salaried spy, in which he spoke of them both; and that with respect to Settembrini, Jervolino asserted that he had been assured by him that a revolution was at hand. Settembrini told Poerio that he did not even know this Jervolino; but on the 23rd of June, 1849, he was arrested, not on any charge, or by lawful authority, but by order of the Prefect of Police, ‘as a measure of prevention, and by direction of the Minister of the Interior.’

Before going farther, we shall give an extract out of Mr. Gladstone’s First Letter to Lord Aberdeen, from which our readers will form an opinion of this miscreant Jervolino, of the Government, whose spy he is, and of the tribunals which received his evidence.

‘Jervolino stated that, having failed to obtain an office through Poerio, he asked him to enrol him in the sect of the *Unità Italiana*. That Poerio put him in charge of a person named Attanasio, who was to take him to another of the prisoners, named Nisco, that he might be admitted. That Nisco sent him to a third person named Ambrosio, who initiated him. He could not recollect any of the forms, nor the oath of the sect! Of the certificate or diploma, or of the meetings, which the rules of the sect when published (as the Government professed to have found them) proved to be indispensable for all its members, he knew nothing whatever.

"How did he know," said Poerio, "that I was of the sect when he asked me to admit him?" No answer.—"Why could not Nisco, who is represented in the accusation as a leader, admit him?" No answer.—"If I, being a Minister of the Crown at the time, was also a member of the sect, could it be necessary for me to have him thus referred to one person, and another, and a third, for admission?" No answer.—"Why has not Ambrosio, who admitted him, been molested by the Government?" No answer.—"Could I be a sectarian when, as a Minister, I was decried and reviled by the exalted party in all their journals for holding fast by the Constitutional Monarchy?" No answer.—Nay, such was the impudent stupidity of the informer, that, in detailing the confidences which Poerio, as he said, had made to him, he fixed the last of them in May 29, 1849; upon which Poerio showed that on May 22, or seven days before, he was in possession of a written report and accusation, made by Jervolino, as the appointed spy upon him, to the police: and yet, with this in his hand, he still continued to make him a political confidant!

'Such was a specimen of the tissue of Jervolino's evidence; such its contradictions and absurdities. Jervolino had, shortly before, been a beggar; he now appeared well dressed and in good condition. I have stated that the multitudes of witnesses called by the accused in exculpation were in no case but one allowed to be called. That one, as I have learned it, was this:—Poerio alleged, that a certain archpriest declared Jervolino had told him he received a pension of twelve ducats a month from the Government for the accusations he was making against Poerio: and the archpriest, on the prisoner's demand, was examined. The archpriest confirmed the statement, and mentioned two more of his relatives who could do the same. In another case I have heard that six persons to whom a prisoner appealed as witnesses in exculpation, were thereupon themselves arrested. Nothing more likely.'

'I myself heard Jervolino's evidence discussed, for many hours, in court; and it appeared to me that the tenth part of what I heard should not only have ended the case, but have secured his condign punishment for perjury.

'I must, however, return to the point, and say, even had his evidence been self-consistent and free from the grosser presumptions of untruth, the very fact of his character, as compared with Poerio's, was enough to have secured the acquittal of the accused with any man who had justice for his object. Nor do I believe there is one man in Naples, of average intelligence, who believes one word of the accusation of Jervolino.'

Settembrini, in his '*Difesa*,' represents to his judges the facts respecting Jervolino and some of his co-spies as follows:—

'Among the paid spies,' says Settembrini, 'who are witnesses at all trials, and who, although imprisoned for swindling, for thieving, for manifest calumnies, are always caressed and employed, that wicked Jervolino was selected and bought to accuse me. He is in

the pay of the police, as is shown by a report of his to Cioffi (an officer of police), which Poerio will produce; he was a hound of Cioffi; he is a vile wretch, who gets twelve ducats per month as blood money. In 1844, he accused his own father of speaking ill of the Government with Bracale, to whom the Commissary of Police, Marchese, showed the original information laid by the son against his father and him. Bracale told me this horrible fact' (*Settembrini*, p. 13.)

Angelillo was not a man to fail a Jervolino, and here are the terms in which he came to the rescue :

'Poerio,' says the learned prosecutor, 'charged Nicola Nisco to get Jervolino enrolled in the Society; and to Nisco was Jervolino sent by Poerio, through Nicola Attanasio. Nisco took Jervolino to d'Ambrosio's house; and there the new associate took the prescribed oaths of secrecy and obedience, and received the sign and passes peculiar to the Society. I cannot refrain from here again observing, that this part of Jervolino's evidence is supported by the often quoted statutes of the Society, by which such ceremonials are required. It is likewise supported, and strengthened, by the answers of Poerio and Nisco, the former avowing his friendship with Nisco and with Attanasio, and Nisco acknowledging his acquaintance with Poerio and with d'Ambrosio. Now, inasmuch as these names and these men must have been unknown to Jervolino; and inasmuch as he positively mentioned them, going even so far as to state the precise quarter where d'Ambrosio lived, and the very number of his house, there is every reason for believing that the knowledge he had thus become possessed of must have come to him through Poerio and Nisco, with whom those persons were on intimate terms, according to their own confessions.' (*Angelillo*, p. 34.)

Poerio and Nisco knew each other: Poerio knew Attanasio and Nisco knew d'Ambrosio: These names and these persons must have been unknown to Jervolino, (why so?) and yet he knew d'Ambrosio's address; is it not therefore clear that he learned what he knew from Poerio and Nisco? Such is the reasoning of Neapolitan crown-lawyers and judges.

Knowing his own character and the weight of his own evidence, Jervolino supposed that he would not be believed unsupported; he therefore applied to two honest persons, Pasquale Marignola and Tomaso Mazzola, and hinted that they might as well give him a help, and chime in with him in charging Poerio, Nisco, and Settembrini. The two men refused the job; and, what is more, swore at the trial, that these overtures were really delicately made to them by Jervolino. But the judges whose principles were more in unison with those of Jervolino than with those of two honest persons, relied on Jervolino's



immaculate evidence. Angelillo used this notable argument to support the man of his heart:—

‘If Jervolino was really looking out for a person whom he could buy to support his evidence, why did he give up looking out for one the moment Marignola and Mazzola refused? . . . If Jervolino did not find any false witnesses it is because he did not look for them, and therefore, Marignola and Mazzola have stated what was false.’ (*Angelillo*, p. 60.)

There is, in fact, no great difficulty in finding false witnesses at Naples. The process and manner of employing them is stated by Settembrini in his ‘*Difesa*,’ before his judges in so detailed a manner, that it is worth repeating in English for our readers’ edification.

‘In a nation corrupted in so many ways, and during so many years, it has not been difficult to get one hundred paid spies who fasten themselves like blood-hounds on those who are pointed out to them, or whom they hate for private reasons. One of them acts the part of accuser, and he produces his compeers as witnesses; and these say the very same things, in the very same order, in the same words, with the same impudence, and the same honesty. They afterwards get about the families of those whom they have accused, and in some indirect manner they ask for money; if they do not get as much as they wish, more charges are trumped up. Thus acted Francesco Paladino, who asked three hundred ducats of Nisco, who will prove it\*; thus have acted the famous spies Barone and Carpentieri, who are now in prison, having tired the world with their cheats and extortions. In the proceedings against Barilla and Leipnecher, Gaetano Vittoria has called as witnesses some agents of police, among whom are Stefano Longobardo, Natale Ardisone, Luigi Antico, Giacomo Vitolo, and the celebrated Gerardo Guida. By the same means the whole province of Salerno is put on its trial. Ruggero Marano being sent to Salerno to discover the pretended Society, this wretch invented the most wicked and absurd calumnies against the best persons in the province; he even impeached the loyalty of the governor of the province, Consiglio, whom he accused of acting a double part, and called for witnesses Emilio Gentile, Samuele Longo, Oronzo Villari, Giacomo Carpentieri, and other low police agents, whose names I give that people may know and remember them. The Commissary Maddaloni went to Salerno to institute a private inquiry without the knowledge of the governor, who, suspecting him of some secret aim, caused him to be arrested; whereupon the ministers dismissed the governor. Other agents caused themselves to be imprisoned, and by teasing the poor prisoners, by misrepresenting their words, by marking their very sighs † inform against them, as has been done by Bernardino Cris-

---

\* Nisco relates the transaction in his ‘*Difesa*.’

† ‘Cum suspiria nostra subscriberentur,’ says Tacitus, of times certainly not worse than these at Naples.

tiano, whose wicked denunciations I can lay before all those who wish to see them; I can also show the lists of persons whom he describes as *pertinacious in republicanism*, as well as the memorials by which he applies for places, and in which he urges the fact of twice having caused himself to be locked up in the prison of S. Francesco by order of the Commissaries Cioffi and Maddaloni, — all documents in Cristiano's own hand: I speak of these, because they are the informers, and witnesses in the proceedings about the "*Unità Italiana*," which form the *procès monstre* in which I am included; the whole being a mass of wickedness, absurdities, and dirt, more shameful for those who have got it together than frightful to those against whom it is directed. Among the most loathsome and vile informers is Antonio Marotta of Pietrapertosa, now imprisoned for theft in Avellino, and charged with calumny on political matters before the Criminal Court of Potenza by the Canon Caramella of Tricarico. In July 1849, he accused as member of a secret society, Francesco Nardi, his uncle, a priest, half an idiot; and in order to persuade him to confirm his evidence, Marotta, dressed in his best, and accompanied by the Inspector of Police, Campagna, presented himself to his uncle in prison, told him that he was in the service of a minister; that he wanted nothing, and would even procure him a living if he would confirm his evidence; which the priest did.\*

Our readers may figure to themselves from these facts the state of the whole case. Numberless villanies fully as abominable as these were unknown, and would have continued to be so, but for Mr. Gladstone's exposure of what he had seen or learned from credible sources. His evidence, however, was not always so direct as Settembrini's, who speaks of the same class of circumstances, not of the very same facts, from his own knowledge, entering into all the particulars which were calculated to provoke contradiction, before persons who had every interest in exposing his mistakes—and yet no one has ventured to gainsay his allegations, no one has dared to impugn his veracity, no one—not even Angelillo—has been bold enough to deny that the wretches with whose names Settembrini sullied his paper were what they were represented by him to be. But it is not only the villanies of the informers, as exposed by Mr. Gladstone, which are so confirmed by Settembrini: the diabolical treatment of the unhappy prisoners before trial, as described by the Right Hon. Gentleman, is fully borne out by Settembrini, who speaks of what he himself has had to undergo.

We have seen that he was arrested on the 23rd of June; on the 29th of October he was removed from the prisons of Sta

---

\* Settembrini, pp. 18, 19. Nardi was condemned to nineteen years imprisonment in irons, and to a fine!!!

**Maria Apparents to those of the Castel dell' Oro, 'where,' he says,**

'I was shut up in solitary confinement, and where the little hair I had on my cheeks was shaved off with insult. I learnt since that my excellent friend, Mr. Philip Agresti, was soon after transferred to the same castle. I saw him at a later period shut up in a horrible dungeon, hewn in the rock, dark and most loathsome, as there was in it a well into which was emptied all the dirt of the other prisoners.' (*Settembrini*, p. 20.)

On the 11th of November, Settembrini was examined by a certain Commissary Silvestri, upon the very points on which he had been examined before by another police agent. Settembrini referred to his former answers, and then asked why the same questions were again put to him?

'The Commissary replied that he was collecting proofs to proceed against persons accused of having, on the 16th of September, by causing a bottle full of inflammable matter to burst, endeavoured to interfere with the blessing that the Pope was giving from the royal balcony to the people.—"But what can I have to do with it, who am in "prison since June?" That act was the doing of the Society, of which you are accused of being one of the heads. You are also accused of having held meetings in your house when the murder of four of the ministers was proposed; and of having approved in prison together with Agresti and Pironti the plan of murdering the minister Longobardi, the Prefect of Police, Peccheneda, and Navarra, the President of the Criminal Court. I do not recollect,' continues Settembrini, 'what I said when I heard such foul and cowardly calumnies, and with what eagerness I asked to be confronted with the vile informer who had so malignantly attacked my honour . . . I went on, and went on; the Commissary answered me with an eloquent shrugging of his shoulders, and sent me back to my prison. The complete information was sent next day to the Criminal Court, so that I was examined merely as a formality, and out of mere cruelty I was kept for forty-two days in the secret prisons† of the Castle. On the 12th of December I was taken to the dark and loathsome prisons of the Vicaria, where I learnt that twenty-seven prisoners had been brought from the Castle. We were all of us thrown, together with other political victims, among thieves, forgerers, and murderers. I wish the magistrates had been present when we first met in that gloomy abode, and peered at each other; they would have perceived how few of us knew one another even by sight.'

And here he states that he found only Poerio, Pironti, Agresti, Persico and Carafa of his acquaintances there; but

---

\* *Le Segrete*, the worse prisons in a gaol: solitary confinement is one of the smallest torments to which a prisoner shut up in them is subject.

that he was not aware even of the existence of the others: and he has been condemned to death for having conspired with them! He then continues:—

‘In the prisons of the Vicaria I have learned wonderfully terrible facts, which I shall relate in order that history may record them, and the world may know the manner of proceeding against us. Lorenzo Vellucci, accused of having stuck up a revolutionary placard at the corner of a street on the night previous to the 16th of September, and Salvatore Faucitano, accused as the author of an explosion which took place before the palace, when arrested and pinioned had to suffer unheard of torments. Dragged along as a sight through the streets, they were beaten, wounded, spat upon, insulted by a few wretches who followed the well known inn-keeper, nicknamed *Monsù Arena*\*, who entered the Castle, and in the presence of the soldiers, pulled out the hair singly from the face of the unfortunate prisoners, and carried away triumphantly a lock of hair shaved off the head of Vellucci. Faucitano, tired and almost fainting from ill-treatment, terrified by threats of farther ill-usage and of death, being before the Commissary and the Prefect of Police, asked for a glass of water: he got a large glass of wine, and then he was forthwith submitted to examination, as he will say and prove. The Prefect of Police, who has nothing to do with the preliminary judicial inquiry, and who in this case appeared as the injured party, assisted at the examination, and examined himself the prisoners Faucitano, Margherita, and Carafa. Luciano Margherita, arrested at Siracusa, then taken pinioned and on foot to Messina, thence to the Castle dell’ Ovo, where he was kept three days fasting, was attacked in another manner. He was told to sign a declaration which would prove entirely harmless, but would give confidence to the Government. He was promised a place, and the protection of the Italian princes; should he refuse, a cannon ball would be tied to his neck and he would thus be thrown into the sea. The declaration was written; the Prefect of Police altered it four several times, and after it had been copied, Margherita signed it, thinking to injure nobody, and to have place and protection. In the same manner was attacked Carafa, who being born and brought up in luxury, frightened by threats and by the prospect of solitary confinement, said and wrote all that they required of him. Every one of the prisoners has related what he has had to undergo in the Castle. Nicola Muro was kept pinioned for five days, only one of his hands being loosened when he was to feed, dry bread and water merely being allowed him. The wife of Giovan Battista Sersale was kept for five days in solitary confinement.† Gaetano Errichiello, having to be shaved and the hair of his head cut, was made to sit on

---

\* This fellow is now dead. He was one of the most blood-thirsty villains that ever lived, allowed by the police to torment and insult honest people with perfect impunity.

† In Segreta. She had committed no crime, and was not accused of any thing.

a chair in the midst of a square surrounded by armed soldiers who told him they had orders to shoot him . . . I have also learned that some of the prisoners were often called before the Inquisitor\*, who said to them,—“to avoid confusion let us make some additions to the “former examination, and unite the whole into one.” The accused, unaware of the consequences, consented: the first examination was torn up, and another substituted under the same date; thus many statements appear as made at an early period although made later, and thus very long, well digested, studied, correct, and even elegant declarations appear in the proceedings.’ (*Settembrini*, pp. 21, 22.)

He does not stop here; but we must. It costs us much to have to translate such passages and to repeat such details, but the truth ought to be known, and those held up to scorn who claim it as a privilege of Conservatives such as they are, to behave like barbarians. *Settembrini* at the end of his ‘*Difesa*,’ has the following words, which we beg of our readers to peruse attentively, and judge what chance there is for innocence when the accused cannot even see all that is alleged against him:—

‘If,’ says *Settembrini*, ‘I had been able to get a copy of all proceedings, and if I had had time and means of reading them, perhaps even in this dark and loathsome den, where I am buried without seeing a ray of sun, where I feel my mind half gone, and my body worn out by sufferings,—perhaps I might have argued the whole of the points, and made observations on the whole of the proceedings.’

He wrote this in April, 1850: he was condemned to death in February, 1851.

We have not, however, as yet completed the statement of facts which make the blood boil; and restraining our indignation, we must continue our narrative.

From what has been stated, it will be perceived that persons are imprisoned without legal authority, proceeded against without respect for fairness or rather for truth in any shape or form, and brutally treated. But the time of their defence will come, our readers will suppose. In the first place, the cause of their arrest, the crime imputed to them, and the names of the accusers are kept for an indefinite period of time, or even altogether, concealed from the prisoners. What *Settembrini* says of himself, is the rule, not the exception. *Nisco* begins his ‘*Costituto*’ in the following manner:

---

\* i. e. the magistrate who was charged with the proceedings which are by law required before trial. He interrogates the persons accused, as well as the witnesses, and has an unlimited power of doing harm. Of course the man picked out for such a duty is a particularly unprincipled scoundrel.

‘It is very surprising that after fifteen months passed in the various prisons whereto I have been dragged, I find myself now for the first time in the presence of magistrates, and accused of having belonged to a fancied secret society, respecting which hitherto no one has ever asked me a single question.’

Poerio says, —

‘I asked to be confronted with my cowardly and low calumniators, and I insisted upon knowing the proofs of the accusation; but my legal request was never granted, against the clear letter of the law.’

In October, the same Gentleman was removed from the prison of San Francesco to the Castle dell’Ovo, where he was placed in solitary confinement. Five days after, he was told by the Inquisitor that he was accused of a plot to upset the *Constitutional* Government!!! and of complicity in the crime of having revolutionary proclamations stuck up in public on the night of the 15th of September.

‘I repelled, says Poerio, ‘with all my might so foolish and so foul an accusation. I asked to see the pretended proofs of my guilt, ready to clear myself at once, and the Inquisitor was silent! I asked to be confronted with my vile accuser, being confident that I should be able to put him to shame in a moment as a mean and cowardly calumniator, and the Inquisitor continued silent. After seventy days of solitary confinement, during two months of which I was not allowed to see even my excellent mother, I have been kept in the Castle four long months; I have been at last dragged to the prison of the Vicaria, in which those accused of political crimes are mixed with those accused of any crime; for nearly two months my life is wasting away in one of those rather dens than prisons, where ten or twelve human beings are heaped together and stowed away like pigs, and I have not been yet able to learn what it is that is falsely alleged against me, and what is the name of my dastardly calumniator.’ (*Atti*, p. 78.)

But even when the offence laid to a man’s charge is shown to be an impossibility, when the pretended proofs fall to the ground of themselves, the accused are not only not in better condition, but may be in a worse. Poerio was accused of complicity in the affair of the proclamations posted on the corners of the streets when he was in prison. To connect him with those who acted out of prison, the Director of police, Peccheneda, wanted to induce one of the accomplices, Carafa, who had seen a copy of the proclamation, to say, that he had spoken of it to Poerio before the night of the 15th of September, when the proclamations were passed: the worthy Peccheneda promised Carafa that he would be immediately out of trouble if he lent himself to his views. But this was asking from Carafa to prove, what was impossible, because it appeared from the prison

registra, that he had never been to see Poerio after the day, when, by surprise, he himself was shown the proclamations. The vile scheme fell of itself; but is it not manifest that Peccheneda must have hated, and persecuted the more, the man whom he had failed in making a victim in the manner which he proposed? As to yielding to conviction, it was not a thing to be thought of as regarded Peccheneda. 'All my unanswerable arguments,' says Poerio, 'did not shake the Prefect's invincible persuasion of my *knowledge* of that vile affair, and he spitefully dismissed Carafa, saying, "Sir! You will ruin yourself! Well! I leave you to your fate."'

The scheme of the pretended letter of Dragonetti addressed to Poerio, which is only partly related by Mr. Gladstone, will show how useless it is to hope for justice or to trust to the best defence where such infantries as that can be committed. We shall translate Poerio's own version of this affair:—

'A letter was forged purporting to be written and signed by the Marquis Dragonetti of Aquila. This letter was entrusted to a compeer in Aquila, with a request that he would post it and direct it to me at Naples. But the schemer of this atrocious villany wanted, in carrying it into execution, to pay the utmost respect to the Constitution, in which it is written that no letter should be opened. For this purpose the letter to me was enclosed in a second one, forged in Dragonetti's name like the first, directed to an imaginary person at Naples, with a request that this imaginary person should *deliver immediately the enclosure to the Baron Carlo Poerio*. Having done so, the writer trusted to the chapter of *accidents* for the rest; and by the merest accident he was wonderfully assisted in his doings. The family name of the imaginary correspondent of Dragonetti, as *chance* would have it, was that of an obscure officer of police, who, however, bore a different Christian name from that given by the forgerer to his imaginary correspondent. To this police officer, on his going to the post for his letters, was by *chance* delivered, *in mistake*, the letter just arrived from Aquila. The poor police officer had scarcely perused it when he saw that he had got his namesake's letter in mistake; but there was no remedy; as he had opened the letter he could not return it. Yet having seen those terrible names, Dragonetti and Poerio, the poor unhappy clerk trembled and was horrified at thinking himself, even for one moment, the possessor of a correspondence which could be but of a revolutionary and treasonable character. The honest man had no peace till he had deposited that pestiferous letter in the pure hands of the police. And the police, vying with the happy writer of the letter in zeal for the observance of the Constitution, anent the inviolability of letters, drew up a most regular memorandum of the event; and, resisting the culpable inclination of prying into my secrets without my consent, it respected the seal of the letter addressed to me, took charge of the document, and ordered my arrest.' (*Poerio*, pp. 29, 40.)

What followed, Mr. Gladstone tells better than we could, and we shall therefore let him relate it:—

‘On the sixth day, [from that of his arrest, Poerio] was brought before the Commissary Maddaloni; and a letter, with the seal unbroken, was put into his hands. It was addressed to him, and he was told that it had come under cover to a friend of the Marquis Dragonetti, but that cover had been opened in mistake by an officer of the police, who happened to have the same name, though a different Christian name, and who, on perceiving what was within, handed both to the authorities. Poerio was desired to open it, and did open it, in the presence of the Commissary. Thus far, nothing could be more elaborate and careful than the arrangement of the proceeding. But mark the sequel. The matter of the letter of course was highly treasonable; it announced an invasion by Garibaldi, fixed a conference with Mazzini, and referred to a correspondence with Lord Palmerston, whose name was miserably mangled, who promised to aid a proximate revolution. “I perceived at once,” says Poerio, “that the handwriting of Dragonetti was vilely imitated, and I said “so, remarking that the internal evidence of sheer forgery was higher “than any amount of material proof whatever.” Dragonetti was one of the most accomplished of Italians; whereas this letter was full of blunders, both of grammar and of spelling: It is scarcely worth while to notice other absurdities; such as the signature of name, surname, and title in full, and the transmission of such a letter by the ordinary post of Naples. Poerio had among his papers certain genuine letters of Dragonetti’s; they were produced and compared with this; and the forgery stood confessed. Upon the detection of this monstrous iniquity, what steps were taken by the Government to avenge not Poerio, but public justice? None whatever: the papers were simply laid aside.’ (*Gladstone*, p. 19.)

As we have seen, one of the accusations was, that several of the persons, who were to be brought to trial, had plotted the murder of the President of the Court who was going to try them. This President laid before his brother judges his ‘scruple’ whether he ought to sit in judgment or not? thereby showing that he felt his own weakness, and the indecency of his continuing to take part in the proceedings. This President is Navarro or Navarra, a man who boasts of having condemned to death 3000 persons! The Court held that there was nothing in his ‘scruple.’ Mr. Gladstone relates how, on the prisoners objecting to be tried by that President, the Court declared the objection ‘frivolous and vexatious.’ This monstrous decision was confirmed on appeal, the counsel as well as the parties who applied for justice on this head being condemned to a fine of one hundred ducats. But this is not all. We learn from Settembrini (*Difesa*, p. 24.) that the two advocates who argued in support of the prisoners’ exception to Navarra—‘the most



'zealous Navarra' as he is officially and ominously designated by the public prosecutor — became the object of a *persecution* as foul as the rest; and that one of them — Giacomo Tofano — was thrown into prison, whilst the second — Gennaro di Filippo — was obliged to fly the country. Navarra presided over the Court, the witnesses of the accuser were perjured, those for the defence not heard, the counsel imprisoned: could the result be other than what it was?

There is one fact more which we beg to mention with respect to this abominable tragedy. The persons tried were accused of acts importing high treason committed in 1848. Their trial began so long after, that many of the witnesses were admitted to depose, as to certain facts, according to their own impression, the circumstances essential to constitute the crime having been forgotten by them, owing to the long time that had elapsed since they were said to have occurred. Thus that pre-eminent villain Jervolino, — who deposed that he had been admitted to a secret Society, which we firmly believe never to have existed, — when asked for the signs, oaths, &c. constituting the criminal essence of the Society, declared that he had forgotten them, owing to the time that had intervened; and the judges received his evidence, admitted his apology for not entering more into details, and deprived the innocent victims of his calumnies of the means of testing his credulity, and of showing what was the real nature of the Society of which he spoke. The accuser — a spy — was left to judge of the nature, and therefore of the criminality, of certain acts which he was unable to specify. Moreover, facts thus vaguely charged could not possibly be contradicted. The trial — that is, the mockery of what was paraded before the public as a trial — began about a year after the accused had been imprisoned for acts committed, it was said, a year before the time of their arrest. That trial took place before a *special* court, instituted partly under the pretext of a *speedy* administration of justice; it lasted exactly EIGHT MONTHS, from the 1st of June, 1850, to the 31st of January, 1851. The indictment consisted of several intricate counts for each of the persons accused; and these counts, cunningly framed, were to be supported by a variety of documents and of such written evidence as we have had occasion to specify in the course of this Article — that is, reports of spies, evidence of what was said by third parties not before the Court, secret reports of commissaries of police, &c. In the 'Atti' we find reference given to TWENTY-FIVE volumes of such documents and written evidence, collected *ex parte* before the trial. The judges, as they are called, retired to consider their judgment on the 31st of January, 1851; they

deliberated during the rest of that day, the whole of the night of the 31st, and during part of the 1st of February; on the morning of which day — after twenty hours' discussion — they pronounced their sentence. Will any man of common sense believe it possible that justice can be administered by such means, and where such is the manner of trying political cases?

On the morning of the 1st of February, whilst the judges were still deliberating, Settembrini, who fully expected to be condemned to death, as he eventually was, addressed to his wife the most touching, noble, and manly letter that we can conceive it possible to write under such circumstances. It breathes the serenity of mind of innocence, the resignation of a Christian, and the affection of an attached husband and father, as well as the calm reliance on truth of a martyr. Conscious of our inability to render all the feeling, the delicacy and graceful elegance of the original, we lay it before our readers, certain that competent judges will find our praises both of the sentiments and of the style amply deserved..

‘ 1° Febbraio, 1851, orotto del mattino.

‘ Io voglio, o diletta e sventurata compagna della vita mia, io voglio scriverti in questo momento che i giudici stanno da sedici ore decidendo della mia sorte.

‘ Se io sarò dannato a morte, non potrò più rivederti, nè rivedere le viscere mie, i miei carissimi figliuoli. Ora che sono serenamente disposto a tutto, ora posso un poco intrattenermi con te. O mia Gigia! io sono sereno, preparato a tutto; e quello che più fa meraviglia a me stesso, mi sento la forza di dominare questo cuore ardente, che di tanto in tanto vorrebbe scoppiarmi nel petto. Oh guai a me se questo cuore mi vincesses! Se io sarò dannato a morte, io posso prometterti pel nostro amore, e sull' amore de' nostri figliuoli, che il tuo Luigi non ismentirà se stesso; morirò colla certezza che il mio sangue sarà fruttuoso di bene al mio paese, morirò col sereno coraggio de' martiri, morirò, e le ultime mie parole saranno alla mia patria, alla mia Gigia, al mio Raffaello, alla mia Giulia. A te, ed ai carissimi figliuoli non sarà vergogna che io sia morto sulle forche; voi un giorno ne sarete onorati. Tu sarai strittrata dal dolore, lo so; ma comanda al tuo cuore, o mia Gigia, e serba la vita per i cari figli nostri, ai quali dirai che l' anima mia sarà sempre con voi tutti e tre, che io vi vedo, che io vi sento, che io seguito ad amarvi come vi amava, e come vi amo in quest' ora terribile.

‘ Io lascio ai miei figliuoli l' esempio della mia vita, ed un nome, che ho cercato sempre di serbare immacolato ed onorato. Dirai ad essi che ricordino quelle parole che io dissi dallo sgabello nel giorno della mia difesa. Dirai ad essi che io benedicevodi e baciandoli mille volte lascio ad essi tre precetti: riconoscere ed adorare Iddio; amare il lavoro; amare sopra ogni cosa la patria. Mia Gigia adorata! eran queste le gioie che io ti prometteva nei primi giorni del nostro amore, quando ambedue giovanetti, tu a quindici anni con invidiata

bellezza, e con rara innocenza, ed io a venti anni pieno il cuore di affetti e di speranze, e con la mente avida di bellezza, di cui vedeva in te un esempio celeste, quando ambedue ci promettevamo una vita d'amore, quando il mondo ci pareva così bello e sorridente, quando disprezzavamo il bisogno, quando la vita nostra era il nostro amore? E che, abbiamo fatto noi per meritare tanti dolori, e tanto presto? ma ogni lamento sarebbe ora una bestemmia contro Dio, perchè ci condurrebbe a negare la virtù per la quale io muoio. Ah! Gigia; la scienza non è che dolore; la virtù vera non produce che amarezze. I miei nemici non sentono la bellezza e la dignità di questi dolori. Essi nel mio stato tremerebbero: io sono tranquillo perchè credo in Dio, e nella virtù. Io non tremo; deve tremare chi mi condanna, perchè offende Dio.

‘Ma sarò io dannato a morte? Io mi aspetto sempre il peggio dagli uomini. So che il Governo vuole un esempio, che il nome è il mio delitto, che chi ora sta decidendo della mia sorte ondeggia tra mille pensieri, e tra mille paure: so che io sono disposto a tutto.

‘Sarò sepolto in una galera, con un supplizio peggiore e più crudele della morte? Mia Gigia, io sarò sempre io. Iddio mi vede nell'anima e sa che io non per forza mia, ma per forza che mi viene da Lui, sono tranquillo. Vedi, io ti scrivo senza lagrime, con la mano ferma e corrente, con la mente serena; il cuore non mi batte. Mio Dio, ti ringrazio di quello che operi in me: anche in questi momenti io ti sento, ti riconosco, ti adoro e ti ringrazio. Mio Dio consola la sconsolatilissima moglie mia, e dàle forza a sopportare questo dolore. Mio Dio proteggi i miei figliuoli, sospingili tu verso il bene, tirali a te, essi non hanno padre, son figli tuoi, preservali da' vizj: essi non hanno alcun soccorso dagli uomini, io li raccomando a te, io prego per loro.

‘Io ti raccomando, o mio Dio, questa Patria; dà senno a quelli che la reggono, fa che il mio sangue plachi tutte le ire, e gli odj di parte; che sia l'ultimo sangue che sia sparso su questa terra desolata. Mia Gigia, io non posso più proseguire, perchè temo che il cuore non mi vinca. Addio, o cara, o diletta, o adorata compagna delle mie sventure, e della mia vita. Io non trovo più parole per consolarti; la mano comincia a tremarmi. Abbiti un bacio, simile al primo bacio che ti diedi. Danno uno per me al mio Raffacello, uno alla mia Giulia; benedicili per me: ogni giorno, ogni sera che li benedirai, dirai loro che li benedico anche io. Addio.’

The writer of this noble and pathetic letter was what is called pardoned; that is, his life was not taken at once, but he was condemned to a lingering death among the horrors of Neapolitan prisons, so well and so correctly described by Mr. Gladstone. For the Neapolitan Government it is not enough to take life with the daring of the assassin; life is taken with studiously refined and protracted cruelty; the victims are not openly dispatched, for that would deprive their pitiless persecutors of the exquisite pleasure of seeing them die by inches

in cheerless solitude, unattended by friends, by parents, by relations: sinking slowly under the accumulated weight of moral as well as physical torture. For it is torture to bury human beings in dark underground dens, not seldom below the level of the sea by which they are surrounded: it is torture to tie two human beings together, and never, never for one moment relieve them from each others' presence; it is torture to stow away living human beings in cemeteries\*: denying them what, in the name of decency, human beings require, not to live the life of unclean brutes. These and many more too revolting to enumerate, are the kinds of torture inflicted on men of education; gentlemen by birth and by habits; on persons to whom their sovereign has appealed in time of need for assistance and advice, which they have given both in their public and private capacity; on men of honour, by whom degradation is a thousand times more keenly felt than the loss of life; and, what is the climax of atrocity, innocent men basely and foully doomed to destruction by the Government from which they have a right to expect protection.

---

\* In 'The Examiner' of the 23rd of last August, appeared the following translation of a letter, of which we have seen the original, and the authenticity of which is indisputable. For obvious reasons the names and the precise day when it was written, are omitted:—

'Dear A. . . .—I am astonished on hearing you never got any letter from me, as I have written three. I am, however, confident you will now have got them, and learnt my present not enviable situation. I bear it all with that resignation which I hope will never abandon me.

'This is a place of aggravated punishment, and it is surprising why, without any fault of ours, or rather why, in spite of most favourable reports, respecting us, we have been brought here.

'The prison is horrible; we sleep on the bare ground, and it is only out of compassion that we have a coverlet. The place in which we are confined was formerly a cemetery, and it swarms with all sorts of vermin. Every comfort is forbidden, and we are not treated like human beings, but like pigs. I bear my misfortune with tranquil resignation, and with inward confidence in Divine Providence.

'I beg you to send me twelve ducats and some clean linen by . . . I have been four days without change of shirt, as we are forbidden to have any box wherein to keep linen. Chairs, lights, and tables, as well as beds, and all the necessary conveniences for the night, are likewise forbidden.

'Life itself is not safe in this place. The day before our happy arrival one of the prisoners was murdered with twenty-seven wounds from a dagger. . . .

'Ischia, March, 1851.'

The truth of these charges, undenied and undeniable, stamps on the forehead of their perpetrators and their abettors a mark of infamy, which will last so long as truth and humanity are not banished from the world. We do not consider that the single exception of one Mr. Macfarlane, who has had the audacity to deny some of the facts which Mr. Gladstone relates of his own knowledge, requires that we should modify our assertion that these damning charges stand undenied. That the facts stated by Mr. Gladstone are undeniable it is for us superfluous to observe. What Mr. Gladstone states as a fact will be believed by all civilised Europe, were the whole of the Neapolitan Government and of its myrmidons to deny it. And if a proof had been wanting of the system of fraud and falsehood on which that Government rests, and of the utter want of principle and common honesty among its agents, that proof would have been supplied by Mr. Macfarlane's mendacious pamphlet. 'The Examiner' has shown, with a closeness of reasoning and terseness of argument worthy of its old reputation, that the advocate and the defence stand on a par with the clients and the cause; in which the Neapolitan Government has concurred, by adopting that defence, and causing it to be diplomatically communicated to other Courts as an answer (!) to Mr. Gladstone's overwhelming statements.

We find, moreover, in 'The Times' of the 23rd of September an abridgment of the official 'defence' of the Neapolitan Government; and the 'defence' is worthy of that Government; for it rests wholly on such barefaced falsehoods that the task of exposing them is not only heavy but disgusting. The statements of Mr. Gladstone are of two kinds: those of facts within his own knowledge, and those of facts he has heard on credible authority. Among the former there is this: 'I have seen,' says Mr. Gladstone (we are happy to quote from the TWELFTH edition of his letters),

'The official doctors not going to the sick prisoners, but the sick prisoners, men with almost death on their faces, toiling upstairs to them at that charnel house of the Vicaria, because the lower regions of such a palace of darkness are too foul and loathsome to allow it to be expected that professional men should consent to earn bread by entering them. . . . The filth of the prisons is beastly. The officers, except at night, hardly ever enter them. I was ridiculed for reading with some care pretended regulations posted up on the wall of an outer room. One of them was for the visits of the doctors to the sick. . . . I have walked among a crowd of between three and four hundred Neapolitan prisoners: murderers, thieves, all kinds of ordinary criminals, some condemned and some uncondemned, and the politically accused, indiscriminately. . . . This swarm of human beings

all slept in a long low vaulted room, having no light, except from a single and very moderate-sized grating at one end.'

To these precise statements of an English gentleman hear the answer of the Neapolitan Government: —

'It is notorious that this prison (the Vicaria) is conducted in a very regular and judicious manner. In case of illness medical assistance is immediately procured, and it is an insult to the distinguished character of the physicians of Naples to allege that they perform their duties in the manner that Mr. Gladstone says, which, if true, would render them a disgrace to humanity.'

Mr. Gladstone has not, therefore, seen what he says he did! To such an answer we cannot condescend to make a reply.

Mr. Gladstone had heard that the number of State prisoners in the kingdom of the Two Sicilies was from 15,000 to 20,000; and in its defence, the Neapolitan Government, on the 15th of September, has the courage to repeat what its worthy advocate, Macfarlane, had the impudence to state six weeks before, namely — that the prisoners were only 2024. This gross untruth was so ably exposed in 'the Examiner' of the 16th of August, that we cannot do better than transcribe the passage from that newspaper: —

'The first skirmish in which facts are used is one to which we direct close attention. Thus speaks Mr. Macfarlane: —  
 "The right honourable gentleman affirms that 'the general belief is, that *the prisoners for political offences in the*  
 "KINGDOM OF THE TWO SICILIES are between fifteen or  
 "twenty and thirty thousand,' and that he himself believes  
 "that twenty thousand is no unreasonable estimate.' Now,  
 "the police reports sent to me from Naples prove that the total  
 "number of these state prisoners is two thousand and twenty-  
 "four! I will admit that even this is a deplorable number;  
 "but when it is considered that there was a revolution at  
 "Naples, a sanguinary revolution in Sicily," &c. &c. "That  
 "there may be no mistake, my Lord Aberdeen, I lay before  
 "you the Neapolitan prison returns, which are officially signed,  
 "and are indisputably correct." The tables follow. These are  
 "the tables, in which "I have not translated the Italian." That  
 "there may be no mistake we, then, will furnish one line of  
 "translation, and expose the coarse fraud over which, when  
 "cloaked under an unfamiliar language, it was hoped that the  
 "eye might skip. The triumphant preface, and the war-dance  
 "around Mr. Gladstone after the quotation of a statistical-  
 "looking column, might divert men very fairly from a suspicion  
 "that all was not right. But now what are these boasted tables?

‘ They are an account “ *Degl’ imputati politici, presenti in giu-  
 ‘ “ dizio, presso le G. C. speciali, de’ Reali Dominj continentali*”  
 ‘ — of the accused, now present to be tried, by the Special Gr.  
 ‘ Courts of the continent ! In reply to Mr. Gladstone’s estimate  
 ‘ of all prisoners for political offences in the kingdom of the Two  
 ‘ Sicilies, it is attempted to delude the English public with a list  
 ‘ only of those prisoners who are awaiting trial, excluding every  
 ‘ man tried already and condemned ; and even this, not a list of  
 ‘ all the accused, but only of those who will be tried before  
 ‘ Special Grand Courts ; and not even all those included, but  
 ‘ only those who will be tried before the Special Grand Courts  
 ‘ of the continent. Sicily is conveniently dropped, and no ac-  
 ‘ count is rendered of “ those lovely islands scattered along the  
 ‘ “ coast (we quote Mr. Gladstone), whose picturesque and  
 ‘ “ romantic forms delight the eye of the passing voyager, igno-  
 ‘ “ rant what huge and festering masses of human suffering they  
 ‘ “ conceal.” ’

As to poor Poerio, it is false that he was imposed on the Crown by the Clubs as Minister, as is now asserted in the official ‘ defence ’ of the Neapolitan Government : so utterly false, that not only the King would not accept his resignation, when offered, but he sent to him the Duke of Mignano, to request he would withdraw it. After he had ceased to be minister, Poerio was urged by the Duke of Balzo, the Queen Mother’s husband, to attend a meeting of leading political men on the state of the country, which meeting Poerio attended on condition that he should not have to take office. Many times subsequently his Sicilian Majesty has sent to him Captain Carrascosa for advice on knotty political points : even after the 15th of May, 1848, since which time the King has been rid of Clubs, and of every opposition whatever, Poerio was asked, in the King’s name, by Carrascosa, for his opinion in writing on the political state of affairs, which opinion Poerio gave. And at a still later period the King was pleased twice to express himself most graciously to Poerio in person with respect to his conduct while he was Minister. To the allegation that Poerio was condemned on other evidence than that of Jervolino, we distinctly reply that it is of a piece with the other assertions of the Neapolitan Government,—judges, police, and agents of all sorts ; and we shall say no more after such specimens of a Government’s official defence.

That the diplomatic body ‘ consider ’ Poerio guilty, as the correspondent of ‘ The Times ’ says, we have no doubt. Can Austria, Russia, the Pope, and, what is much worse, despotic and unscrupulous republican France, say otherwise ? We know

French agents who, not long ago, have informed their Government, from Naples, of some of the very facts since brought to light by Mr. Gladstone, and who now, having removed to another latitude, are shamelessly contradicting what they then stated; not less eager to efface their former statements than to disavow their former principles. Such are St. Gennaro's miraculous powers!!! Honourable men may look on this jugglery with silent contempt, but they cannot forget: *Non tam in potestate nostrâ est oblivisci quam tacere.*

The fact is, that in every thing, great and small, high and low, the persons now at the head of affairs at Naples cannot act, speak, or write, without a violation of truth. The principle of that Government is falsehood, which is resorted to even when truth would serve as well; but truth is an element of government unknown to that Cabinet. An instance of this occurs in the work by the pseudo O'Raredon, the entire title of which we have given at the head of this Article. The whole consists of a tissue of declamations and misstatements about England, Ireland, our Government, above all respecting the Lords Minto and Palmerston, Sicily, Naples, and the rest of Italy. This might have been printed, either anonymously or with the real authors' names, avowedly at Naples, and in Italian. But then there would have been something of truth in the publication, and that the Neapolitan Government could not brook. Therefore the book purports to be written in French by an Irishman, blessed with the uncommon name of P. C. O'Raredon, and printed at Geneva by Cherbuliez, — every one of which statements is false. The clumsiness of this forgery is equal to that with which the letter of Dragonetti to Poerio was forged. The style of printing is Italian, — or more correctly speaking, Neapolitan; — the numberless errors of orthography are evidence that the book was not printed where French is the language of the country\*; the still more numerous errors in English and English names, prove clearly that not even an Irishman could have committed them, and the Italianisms which abound in every line betray the Ausonian authorship of this absurd libel. In the very first page we find, 'L'époque du 1848 . . . est déjà entré dans le domaine, 'de l'histoire.' The phrase 'du 1848' is pure Italian 'del 1848,' and not at all French; and no French printer would allow such a blunder as 'époque . . . entré' to pass. We open the book at hazard, and we find, —

---

\* We hope that M. Cherbuliez, whose name has been so unwarrantably used, will have been able by this time to meet with a copy of this production, disgraceful to a printer of his deservedly high reputation.



'Bientôt la dépense des ministères fut commandée sous la désignation de budgets, avec les annotations propres à éclairer l'emploi des deniers publics . . . Le roi soutenait (chose dont il y a bien des témoins) avec une sagacité merveilleuse les réformes les plus raisonnables, comme si les finances avaient été l'études de sa jeunesse. Avec les vrais principes de la matière, il fit bientôt que les dépenses ne dépassassent jamais les moyens, et surtout qu'ils ne fussent employés à des futiles dissipations.' (P. 72.)

Now here 'budgets' is a blunder, and an absurdity applied to 'la dépense' only; 'denier' has no accent; 'l'études' is a discordance, and '*des futiles*' is an error, instead of *de*. We mark only such errors as no French printer would commit. 'Les annotations' and the 'soutenait' are both Italianisms, and not French, in the sense here used. In the next page we find in two lines 'aggravant' instead of 'aggravant,' 'privilège' instead of 'privilège,' and 'rabaissa le tariff,' which is not a French but a purely Italian phrase. It is still more amusing to see Lord Minto repeatedly called 'Sa Grace,' as are also Lord Palmerston and Lord Mount-Edgumbe, who is sometimes designated as Lord Mounth-Edgumbe, and sometimes as Lord Edgumbe; the Duke of Wellington *per contrà* being only Lord Wellington. Sir H. Bulwer and Admiral Parker are both 'Lords;' the 'Whigs' are 'Wighs;' Lord Lansdowne is repeatedly 'Landsdowne;' and so on. The following passage is decisive on the point of Irish authorship. O'Raredon, speaking of the sulphur question, informs us, that 'Notre Attorney and Sollicitor-General lui-même se prononça pour le roi des deux Siciles.' (P. 236.) The authors of this wretched performance are a M. Cantalupo and one Peter Ulloa. Peter, we are told, is a judge; nothing more likely, that being the body of men which seems to have at Naples an inexhaustible stock of tale-tellers and forgerers. The original contriver of all this has been, we are informed, the famous, or infamous Peccheneda, Director of Police, than whom no man, even at Naples, has invented more falsehoods to deceive his king, and torment and ruin his fellow-subjects.

The gigantic trial of the innocent persons accused of belonging to the Society l'Unità Italiana is but one of many by which it is intended to sacrifice to party spirit and to foul passions the lives of the *élite* of the nation, mixing with them some persons of less note. Thus very recently some persons of inferior station, whose crime was that of having shouted, towards the end of 1848, 'Long live the Constitution' have been tried. We don't know the particulars; we only know that twenty-six persons have been condemned to various punishments.

the mildest of which was **TWENTY-FOUR** years' imprisonment in irons. And let it be observed, that all those found guilty, whether present or *en contumace*, are condemned *in solidum* to pay the expenses and damages; under which head comes, for instance, the injury done to property by the king's troops; so that under this pretext the property of a man so condemned is seized by the Government. At times, however, the Government plunders capriciously without any pretext. A few days ago a Neapolitan gentleman of fortune, formerly a Member of Parliament, and now an exile, came over to see the Exhibition. On his return to Paris, where he has taken up his abode, he found letters informing him that the Government had seized his property. He is thus reduced to absolute want, without the slightest intimation of the reasons which have induced the Government to commit this new spoliation. Acts like this are of daily occurrence.

One of the monster trials now, we believe, in progress, is that of persons accused of having taken part in the affair of the 15th of May, 1848; when a long and sanguinary fight took place in the streets of Naples, which terminated in the complete victory of the King's troops over the people. Naples was treated by the brutal soldiery, as it was formerly the custom to treat a place taken by assault. How that deplorable collision began, and by whom it was brought about, is fiercely disputed; for us it is enough to know how it ended. Nine days afterwards — on the 24th of the same month of May — the King, of his own accord, and without any Minister's signature, published a proclamation, in which he not only assured the Neapolitans of his determination to carry out the Constitution, but he called on them to trust to his honour, to his religion, and to his oath, assuring them that he was only bent on effacing, as far as possible, even the remembrance of the fatal 15th of May.\* On the 17th of May more than six hundred persons, arrested with arms in their hands, had been released. About one year after that royal proclamation and this act, several persons, among them some of those set at liberty on the 17th, were arrested again; and now, nearly three years and a half

---

\* The words are most solemn: *Fidatevi con effusione di animo della nostra legalità, della nostra religione e del nostro sacro e spontaneo giuramento, e vivete nella pienissima certezza che la più incessante preoccupazione dell' animo nostro è di abolire al più presto, insieme allo stato eccezionale, e passeggero in cui ci troviamo, anche, per quanto sarà possibile, la memoria della funesta sventura che ci ha colpiti.*

after the imputed crime has been so solemnly forgiven — after that most ample act of oblivion on the part of the King—these persons are to be tried.

We cannot believe that this is done with the King's knowledge. No individual, however lost to shame and to honour, would allow himself to be held up to everlasting infamy by even the appearance of consenting to so barefaced a violation of his pledged word. This is, however, what the Neapolitan Government do with respect to their King; than whom no man has had more reason to pray to be preserved from his friends.

Among these dangerous friends Mr. Baillie Cochrane has forced himself. In his 'Young Italy,' this gentleman has done his best to represent His Sicilian Majesty as capable, not only of dissembling his real feelings for the purpose of imposing on simple folk, but of the gross and vulgar deception of gaining credit to himself by gratuitously promising to act one way—and then acting just the contrary. The facts, as related by Mr. Baillie Cochrane, are these. On one of those 'cold, harsh, bitter mornings, not uncommon at Naples,' and which we presume to be one of the many causes why Englishmen in particular, who neither rise early nor travel to misinform themselves, prefer the soft, genial, and refreshing London fogs to the Neapolitan climate — on one of those mornings Mr. Baillie Cochrane walked out to keep himself warm, and called upon the King at Caserta for the purpose of giving him a little wholesome advice. His Majesty being at home, was most graciously pleased to listen to the lecture on statecraft, which the M.P. for Bridport was generous enough to volunteer, to deliver to him. The eloquence, elegance, and power of reasoning which, abroad, distinguish the honourable member, produced their effect on the King, who kept awake nevertheless, and who promised to follow the advice gratuitously tendered, — namely, that the political prisoners should be kept separate from other offenders; and that the Government should not promote petitions against the Constitution. His Majesty threw in, of his own accord, strong hopes that a partial amnesty might be soon conceded. Mr. Cochrane apparently had not the courage to suggest such an act of justice rather than mercy. 'So far, so well,' as he phrases it. Now mark, gentle reader, the result of this interview: —

'To my very deep regret,' says Mr. Cochrane, 'I have heard from Naples that the political prisoners have been only removed to a much worse place; that their communications with their families have been still more restricted; that the few who were released were men quite unimportant and would have been discharged at any rate; and what gives countenance to several other reports is, that within the last few

weeks, I see by the papers that the Constitution has been virtually abolished.' (P. 277.)

There must be some mistake here. We have a better opinion of Mr. Baillie Cochrane than to suppose that he would proclaim how he was stultified and yet give no sign of that manly indignation which a gentleman so treated, by no matter whom, must feel. Mr. Cochrane, we know, is not incapable of indignation: he gives vent to it in most unmeasured terms against the unfortunate, the fallen, and the oppressed, whom he misrepresents and insults. On the other hand, even he must be aware that no one has painted His Sicilian Majesty's character in blacker colours than he has done. According to his version of the interview, the King not only deceives but does it from habit — wilfully and deliberately, and when, as on this occasion, he might, with more dignity and less trouble, avoid committing himself in so indecent a manner.

Mr. Cochrane's imagination outweighing both his memory and his judgment together, nothing can be conceived more fanciful than his historical narratives — not even his poetry and his novels; and this may induce His Sicilian Majesty, and his real friends, to forgive Mr. Cochrane for his version of a conversation, which, if correct, would be most disgraceful to that Sovereign. Of Mr. Cochrane's inventive powers, we might multiply instances. Mr. Cochrane describes Garibaldi at Rome, as if he had taken his picture, although he never saw him; he places before us the scene of the meeting at which Rossi's murder was decided upon, as if he had attended it; and yet he invents meeting, actors, and every other circumstance which he relates. Of Rossi himself he writes as if he had been his most intimate friend or rather better. For, although it is evident that he has read the biography of Rossi, to which he never once refers, written by one who *was* his friend, M. Mignet, yet his imagination prevails against M. Mignet and facts. Much of it may be owing to the slight acquaintance of Mr. Cochrane with M. Mignet's language, which is French. A gentleman who does not know that l'Académie de Genève means the University of that place, and who tells us something very absurd about 'the ordres des jour' of Napoleon, is not likely to have understood M. Mignet on those points on which he contradicts him point blank. But however slight his knowledge of French, Mr. Cochrane knows much less of Italian, as may be seen from his quotations. These facts being undoubted — and had we space we might produce conclusive and ludicrous proofs of them — we have only to remark, that were it not for his matchless imaginative faculty it would be difficult

to comprehend how Mr. Cochrane could collect all the absurdities of which he has made a book, and how he could hold conversations, not only with the King, but with the mountaineers of Italy, who, we suspect, understand English no better than Mr. Cochrane does any other language.

There are some statements in Mr. Cochrane's book respecting Lord Minto, worthy of notice not only as being poetical, but as having been pointed out as such to Mr. Cochrane before he published them,—and he having, nevertheless, persisted in giving them circulation as facts. Mr. Cochrane states (p. 75.), that it was not long after his arrival at Rome, before Lord Minto became intimately acquainted with Masi (whose name, as usual, Mr. Cochrane misspells, calling him Massi), Prince Canino, and M. Sterbini. Now this statement is unfounded. Lord Minto received, with the courtesy due to his birth and rank, the Prince of Canino, whenever he was honoured with a visit from him—which was seldom; but he had no intimacy either with the Prince or with M. Sterbini, from whom he received but one visit. With respect to M. Masi, we distinctly aver that Mr. Cochrane was positively and especially told, before he published it, that his story was untrue. Dr. Pantaleoni of Rome, whom Mr. Cochrane consulted respecting his publication, and to whom he submitted some of his notes, told him, and wrote to him, for fear of mistake, that not only was it not the fact that Lord Minto had any intimacy with M. Masi, but that Dr. Pantaleoni himself having asked Lord Minto's permission to present M. Masi to his Lordship, Lord Minto declined to receive that gentleman on account of his extreme political opinions. Dr. Pantaleoni, who has just left England, has repeatedly related this anecdote in our presence, and we challenge Mr. Cochrane to gainsay its correctness. When a writer is capable of such mistakes, his statements sink so low that it is too much to expect that matter-of-fact persons will stoop, we will not say to contradict, but even to notice them. To prove, however, that we are not too severe with Mr. Cochrane, we shall inquire into some more of his tales about Lord Minto.

Mr. Cochrane writes, 'On the 15th of November, about a fortnight after Lord Minto's arrival, the Council of State was nominated; and to celebrate this event there was a procession to the Quirinal of all that was most democratic, to which the representatives of the Great Powers were anonymously invited to attend. In the evening a grand banquet was given at the Théâtre d'Apollon, at which the Ministers, the Council of State, and, most important of all, Lord Minto, were pre-

'sent. The people rose and cheered Lord Minto, when the 'arch-agitator, the modern Rienzi,—Cicceroacchio, entered his 'box, and was welcomed by the English Minister.' (P.75.) Before touching on the facts of the case, we assure Mr. Cochrane that there is no 'Théâtre d'Apollon' at Rome—an Italian City where they speak Italian: there they call 'Teatro d'Apollo' what the French translate 'Théâtre d'Apollon.' Mr. Cochrane occasionally writes French, just as his prototype spoke prose, without knowing it. At page 87., mistaking French for Italian, he puts some familiar French phrases into the Pope's mouth upon addressing the Prince of Teano, one of his Ministers. As to the facts of the case, we beg to inform Mr. Cochrane that if he had asked well-informed and educated gentlemen instead of inquiring of the *valets de place*, he would have learnt that the procession of which he speaks, far from being a procession, of 'all that was most democratic,' was a most striking pageant, to which the splendid State equipages and the gorgeous liveries of the highest Roman Nobility gave that dignity of aristocratic magnificence seldom, if ever, equalled out of Rome. The statement that Cicceroacchio entered Lord Minto's box, and that he was welcomed by his Lordship, is as true as the rest of Mr. Cochrane's nursery tales. It is as true, for instance, as what Mr. Cochrane says a little further on (p. 78.):—'On that 'same 1st of January, a deputation, consisting of Sterbini, 'Canino, and Massi, had an interview with His Holiness.' Instead of Sterbini, Canino, and Massi, read Corsini (the Senator of Rome), who, in fact, waited on the Pope on the 1st, and Doria and Borghese, who waited on him on the 2nd. Mr. Cochrane's informant must have been a wag who, seeing how much terrified that gentleman was by the names of Sterbini and Co., amused himself by frightening him out of his propriety: in which he fully succeeded.

Mr. Cochrane, that *Arbiter elegantiarum*, has ventured to say of Lord Minto, that he wrote like the paid hireling of a party (p. 76). Such language is worthy of the book in which it appears; and in order to show that its author deserves equal credit for his candour and for his taste, we shall give one more extract from his 'Young Italy.' It runs thus:—'The 'events of that memorable day [the 1st of January, 1848] 'are described by Lord Minto in the following dispatch:— '“LORD MINTO TO LORD PALMERSTON, JAN. 13, 1848. '“The new year has opened inauspiciously, with twenty-four '“hours' uneasiness, and *ill humour*, produced by *ill-advised* '“proceedings on the part of the authorities at an *imaginary* '“danger.” No paid hireling of a party could have written in

‘a more partizan spirit.’ Any one would conclude, from Mr. Cochrane’s words, that the whole dispatch consisted of the above few lines; whereas it fills more than one page and a half of the Blue Book (Affairs of Italy, part 2nd, p. 39.). Lord Minto, in his real dispatch, gives a detailed account of the events that passed under his own eyes. Mr. Cochrane not only suppresses this account, but conveys the impression that it never existed, and substitutes that of his *valet de place*. Not satisfied with thus misleading his readers, he cannot help turning into bad English the correct language of Lord Minto. The passage stands thus in the Blue Book:— ‘The new year opened here inauspiciously with four-and-twenty hours of uneasiness and ill-humour, produced by ill-advised proceedings on the part of the public authorities against an imaginary danger.’ There are no italics; Lord Minto does not speak of ‘proceedings *at*,’ but of ‘proceedings *against*.’ In fact, he writes English. We can forgive Mr. Cochrane mistaking French for Italian and being ignorant of both; but as to English—and chiefly as to a gentleman’s English—we would say to him in Cicero’s words:— *Non enim tam præclarum est scire Latine, quam turpe nescire; neque tam id mihi oratoris boni, quam civis Romani proprium videtur.* Having done with Mr. Cochrane, we beg to return, before concluding, to our main subject.

We confidently hope that the publication of the above facts relating to the Neapolitan Courts and Police will have due weight with His Sicilian Majesty, to whom, we are willing to believe, they are unknown. It concerns the honour of his Crown as well as his own, to put an end to practices unworthy of him as a Christian, a king, and a man. We hope also that such conservative powers as are not pledged to foster Red Republicanism and Socialism, and to systematise injustice, unfairness, brutality, and plunder, will condemn as immoral, as well as impolitic, a system of government which seems invented for the annihilation of virtue and of truth, in order to insure the momentary triumph of crime and of falsehood; and, eventually, to render the very name of Monarchy hateful to the world. We implore men of all parties, of all nations, of all creeds to raise an unanimous and unmistakeable cry of abhorrence in the name of outraged humanity against deeds to which pagan tyranny, oriental despotism, and African ferocity can hardly find a parallel.\*

---

\* We were painfully surprised at finding recently in a highly influential publication what appeared to be apologies for the conduct of the Neapolitan Government, and the natural tendency of which

ART. VIII.—1. *The two-fold Protest. A Letter from the Duke of Argyll to the Bishop of Oxford.* London: 1851.

2. *Acts of the Diocesan Synod held in the Cathedral Church of Exeter.* By HENRY, LORD BISHOP OF EXETER, on Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday, June 25, 26, 27 of the year of our Lord 1851. By Authority. London: 1851.

A SHORT year has elapsed since the Pope startled the whole Christian world by the publication of a bull establishing a territorial Roman Catholic hierarchy in England. The agitation

---

undoubtedly must be to encourage that Government to persist in its barbarous course. It is stated that a person who had made inquiries at Naples, avows 'it to be his opinion, that Poerio was guilty of the charges brought against him, of conspiring against the state, and that he did form part of a secret political society for that purpose, though he denied belonging to the association termed the "Unità Italiana."' The question is: was Poerio proved to belong to *this* society? It is also said, 'that the loose and rambling style of Poerio's own defence, accompanied as it is with certain avowals of his opinions for the reconstruction of Italy, by no means establishes his innocence.' Nothing can, in our opinion, be more pithy than Poerio's defence, dated the 8th February, 1850. The *Conclusioni*, or speech of the Attorney-General against him, being of December of the same year — are, therefore, *subsequent to that* defence — the only one of which we have ever heard, and which Poerio wrote *impromptu*, at the moment of his *constituto*, before he knew what the Attorney-General might urge against him. The avowal of his opinions is a proof of his innocence; if guilty of that of which he was accused, he would not have made a parade of opinions which it was his interest to conceal. Ostensibly, Poerio was not tried and condemned for his opinions, nor was it for him to establish his innocence, but for the accusers to establish his guilt. Poerio did show that the chief witness brought against him, Jervolino, was a government spy, and that he was perjured; and on this most important point Mr. Gladstone distinctly states, that he *heard* that man's evidence canvassed at the trial, and that from what he himself heard he had no doubt that Jervolino was guilty of perjury. This is not relying on Poerio's defence only, as Mr. Gladstone is accused of having done by those who cannot have had the same means of judging of the credibility of this Jervolino, the main witness; neither can they have seen more of the evidence on which Poerio and the others were convicted than such *extracts* as the Government has thought proper to publish; yet it is on these slight and unsatisfactory grounds that the misery of those unhappy men is likely to be aggravated; and this too, when at the same time the possibility of Poerio having been unfairly con-



which it created has produced some important results, and seems destined to produce more. The Ecclesiastical Titles Bill has become the law of the land: and we wait to learn from experience what effects it will have in repelling the aggression of the Pope. But it meets a part only, and that the smallest part, of the ecclesiastical dangers which beset the country. The storm which last autumn raged in so many public meetings was the outburst of a feeling of dissatisfaction and alarm long pent up, of a sense of danger within our lines, which had been rendering the country for a considerable period restless and unhappy. On every side there broke forth fierce denunciations against a treason which was betraying the Established Church of England. In the insolence and advances of the foreign invader men saw proofs of confidence in the disorganisation of the garrison he was attacking. It was a grievous thing to find the Pope re-asserting his hated dominion over this free land: but it was far more irritating to discover that he was cheered on by incessant defections of the defenders of that Church which our ancestors had raised to protect us from his assaults. Shame, fear, and anger convulsed the minds of the English nation: and these emotions found frequent vent in language suited to their intensity. And what have been the results? Has the awakened consciousness of danger led to the repairing of our defences, to the restoring the fidelity of our troops, to the taking adequate securities against further defections? Is the position of the Church of England safer and sounder than it was a year ago? Is there less danger of the clergy becoming deserters to the Pope? Are the causes which have produced these secessions weakened or removed? Have the people of this country ground for thinking that her pastors will no longer be the very men who shall seduce their flocks to Rome? These are questions of fearful interest: it deeply concerns all to ascertain what has been, or can be, done.

---

victed is admitted. If it be doubtful whether he has been *fairly* convicted, can there be any doubt that he ought not to have been condemned? True, the barbarity of the punishment is disapproved of, and yet it is observed, in extenuation, that Poerio is not chained day and night to a common malefactor 'as has been alleged.' No one had ever alleged this but Macfarlane, who invented the allegation for the purpose of contradicting it. The cruelty of the punishment consists in keeping two human beings chained day and night together; were they brothers or the most intimate friends, it is an indecent and revolting cruelty: no more than this was ever alleged; and this never has been or can be denied. The letter inserted above, from 'The Examiner,' proves what sort of treatment the prisoners receive at Ischia, whatever may be stated to the contrary.

The Ecclesiastical Titles Bill is the sole tangible product of the excitement. It is obvious that it gives no protection against conversions to the Church of Rome. It is a measure of self-defence against aggression from without by a foreign Power,—a protest by which the nation vindicates its right to be the sole dispenser of honours and titles within its own limits: it is simply a repulse of an attack on the sovereignty and independence of the country. As against the *religion* of Rome it says and does nothing at all. It will not prevent a single conversion which, without it, would have taken place. The causes which swelled the ranks of the Romanists with seceders from the English pale are left untouched by it: it is levelled against the political action only of the Papal Court. On the other hand, no attempt has been made to cure the Church of England of the malady which is consuming her. A demonstration of feeling has been made. It can no longer be said, though the prophets prophesy falsely and the priests bear rule through their means, that ‘my people love to have it so.’ The people of England have manifested, with impassioned warmth, the depth and soundness of their Protestant faith: and some amount of discouragement and repression may be produced by this exhibition of sentiment. But it would be a fatal mistake to suppose that the progress of Popery can be arrested by the tumultuous cheers of excited numbers. The Church of Rome knows when to oppose, and when to bend before the storm. Her faith is on the end. Her patience is not to be wearied out by delay or disappointment, and no violence can subdue her activity. Her policy is infinite in resources. She knows how to subjugate nations by a single sweep of power, or to undermine them by an incessant stream of individual conversions. If Rome is to be driven back, she must be assailed in her fundamental principles: she must be met by a full and brave counter-assertion of the truth. We must have faith in Protestantism: we must appreciate its principles and embrace them thoroughly, or we are lost. This our Protestantism, however, has been shaken—shaken in its hold on the affections and understandings of the clergy. It is openly repudiated by many: others, who have not quite cast it away in their hearts, are ashamed to confess it before men: it is held feebly, and still more feebly avowed.

Do then, we ask, the events of the past year furnish us with any brighter hope for the future? We have indeed chased away some of the anxieties which pressed upon our imaginations. We have learned that the people of England are Protestant still. This is something: for there is always an advantage gained by dissipating an imaginary prestige of success.

Not that this proof of our Protestantism will make the Church of Rome one whit the less persevering or less confident: but it may weaken the inclination so commonly felt to side with what is thought a rising cause. But if nothing more be done: if no progress is made in diminishing the religious and other influences which Rome brings to bear on the minds of men, the vehement protests of last autumn may be but the convulsions which precede death. Lord Shaftesbury indeed promised much. Amidst enthusiastic applause he gave a pledge, that, if the Tractarian treason were not rooted out by the bishops, the laity of England would take up the work in earnest, and obtain safety by an efficient Church reform. The Tractarian disloyalty remains, and Lord Shaftesbury makes no move. We are not bringing an accusation against Lord Shaftesbury. For though our difficulties might be partially removed by legislation, heavy indeed would be the responsibilities which would lie on a real church-reformer. To attempt a reform worthy of the name would be to put the whole Church of England into the crucible: and for this, neither the statesmanship, nor the religious intelligence and feeling of the country, are yet prepared. In our judgment, therefore, Lord Shaftesbury acted more wisely in suspending than he would have done in fulfilling his pledge. Only let us distinctly recognise our real position, — that no bar has as yet been opposed to the advance of Popery, either within or without the Church.

At the same time, it must be admitted that the Tractarian or Anglo-Catholic party has sustained a serious discouragement. The agitation of the public mind has decided the waverings of not a few important persons among the Tractarians. Whether it has been that their doubts had become ripe for resolution, or that the reproaches of Protestants have drawn their attention more forcibly to the ambiguity and untenableness of their position; whatever may have been the immediate cause, they have renounced the communion of the Church of England, and have been reconciled, as it is termed, to that of Rome. Two consequences have followed this act. In the first place, the eyes of many have been opened to the tendency and ultimate effects of Tractarian principles. But a second and a not less impressive result has ensued: the Tractarians have been made to feel distrust of themselves and their position. A party which loses its leaders by continual defections, just in proportion as they are distinguished by learning, ability, and earnestness, must have its confidence shaken, as to the soundness of its views and its power of sustaining them. What can be more damaging to a cause, than to be abandoned in unbroken succession by those who have

fought at its head with the sincerest enthusiasm, and have enjoyed the best opportunities, and have possessed the greatest capacity, for appreciating its merits? A disquieting suspicion of the hollowness of their position has come over the most honest of the Anglo-Catholics: fresh secessions are taking place: and men of equal ability cannot be found to fill up the gaps which have been thus made. Who, among the foremost of the Anglo-Catholic school, except Dr. Pusey and a few of his immediate friends, if even these are to be excepted, can be now considered safe by the Anglo-Catholics themselves?

But we must not fall into the enormous blunder of inferring from the fact of a certain amount of disorganisation having overtaken the Anglo-Catholic party, that the mischief has been destroyed at its root. The eminent men, who have left it for the Romish communion, possessed, if not greater sincerity, at least a clearer intellectual vision and a higher consistency of thinking, than the mass of their former associates. Their condemnation of the Church of England is evidently not acquiesced in by the main body of those whom they have abandoned. As a party, they must be startled and disturbed by the secession of their leaders; but it will not drive the majority of them from their opinions. Any explanation of the fact will be accepted rather than the true, but most unpalatable one, that the principles of Anglo-Catholicism are incompatible with those of the Church of England, as a separate body from the Church of Rome. The parties in question are exposed to the strongest motives which can act on the mind of man to shut their eyes, if possible, to the cogency of the reasoning of which the practical conclusion is secession. If they admit the validity of the premises and the argument, they impose upon themselves the most painful duty of abandoning the religion in which they were bred, and in which they found so much to satisfy their spiritual natures. If they conceded the accuracy of the logic, but escape its force by impugning the premises, they would be compelled to renounce their principles and replace them by the odious doctrines of Protestantism. So they adopt neither the one nor the other of these reasonable, but distressing courses. They keep their understandings in a twilight of ambiguity, neither disowning the principles, nor yet choosing to observe what they involve. The Anglo-Catholic Clergy not only naturally cling with extreme tenacity to a theory which singularly exalts the clergy, but they also find, in the charm which that theory has for clerical minds generally, a support to which they are not fairly entitled, and which is not very creditable to those from whom they obtain it. There is a sound sweet even to many Low-church ears in

opinions which represent episcopally ordained clergymen as the successors of the Apostles, and separate them so flatteringly from Dissenters, by the possession of the awful power of being alone entitled to give efficacy to the Sacraments. Hence a want of heartiness in many of its adversaries in pushing Anglo-Catholicism home: a faintness of resolution in pressing the inmost principles of Protestantism. This secret sympathy is of great value to Anglo-Catholics. It gives them boldness in the enunciation of their views. They are saved by it from a deadly strife of antagonistic principles. By its help they are enabled, in meetings of the clergy, to assume that their doctrines are those of the Church: they feel that they will not be closely challenged, and thus are left apparently in possession of the field. No wonder, in such a state of things, that a sufficient number remain behind to keep each other in countenance, and avoid being driven from their pulpits, by an overwhelming sense of insincerity, in the steps of their more logical and consistent chiefs.

Meanwhile, the consequences to the nation are most disastrous. The stream of conversions to Popery flows on, fed by waters which flow from the Church of England. The garrison appointed to guard the city, though they do not dare to open the gates, undermine the walls so as to let in the enemy. And great indeed is the calamity of subjection to Romish bondage. Our fathers found it insufferable; and we ourselves have had a foretaste of its misery already. Who that has experienced the misfortune of seeing his sons or daughters becoming Papists has not felt that he has lost them altogether—that they are his no longer—that they have become the property of the Confessional, of the Priest, of the Roman Catholic Church? And how, in most cases, have they been lost?—by a cruel abuse practised upon their piety. They listened reverently to the pastor, to whose care their Church had confided them; and from him they imbibed doctrines which they were told were the strength and foundation of that Church, but which, on reflection, were seen to command the transfer of their allegiance to Rome.

This then is the grievous malady under which we now suffer. Anglo-Catholicism cannot refute the reasoning of its departed chiefs: yet, undeterred, it perseveres in the same teaching with the same activity, we might say with the same audacity, as ever. It occupies our parishes, our pulpits, our universities, and our sees; and from this vantage-ground does the work of Rome more effectually than Rome could do it herself. Rome would have to make her advances as an open adversary against men who were on their guard. Anglo-Catholicism seizes on confiding hearers, who are thinking only of the Church of Eng-

land, whilst they are being inoculated with the doctrines of the Church of Rome. Among the clergy it lifts up its head proudly, and summons the priest, as it styles him, to assert that dignity with which Christ has invested him. The younger clergy eagerly put faith in the grandeur which they are told belongs to them. They announce themselves as the appointed mediators between God and man, the dispensers of absolution and pardon, the holders of the keys of the kingdom of heaven. The tone of the whole profession thus sets in strongly in favour of clerical prerogative. Protestantism is fast becoming an object of shame, except where an uncorrupted laity sternly reminds its ministers of those truths which they were ordained to defend.

The evil is intolerable. Let Papists preach Popery freely with all their might; but let a Protestant Church preach the Protestant faith. Above all, it ought not to be made a nursery for rearing converts for transplantation to Rome. The evil must be cut off at its source. Now that source is not religious dogma. What Englishman of our days has forsaken the Church of England because he has become convinced of the doctrine of Transubstantiation, or Purgatory, or Mariolatry, or any other religious tenet peculiar to Rome? The indifference to pure doctrine, which has characterised this movement, has been most remarkable. Theological dogma neither attracts nor repels the minds which are agitated by this movement. They do not fly to Rome to gain a religious truth: nor do those tenets of that Church, which seem most revolting to common sense, cause their steps to falter as they cross the frontier between the two Churches. No dissenter, accordingly, has gone over.

‘It is well known,’ says the Duke of Argyll, ‘that the individual corrupt doctrines of the Romish Church have not been generally — not perhaps in any case — the causes or sources of conviction. On the contrary, it is notorious that these have often been hindrances — impediments in the way of that passage through which so many have advanced from “Oxford to Rome.” The worship, or honour, or whatever it may be called, paid to the Virgin, for example, has, to the very last, been a cause of difficulty and doubt; and this, and other such points of doctrine and practice, have only at last been accepted in submission to one great law of spiritual bondage, under whose yoke the victims had passed before. And what, let me ask you, is that law? Ask some of those to whom I allude, how they have overcome all those objections to the Romish worship and teaching, which you have often heard them express so strongly? Ask them, how they could acquiesce in practices which they used to call, as you now call them, “idolatrous?” You will always get one answer, — “the authority of the Church.”’

It is wholly a question of the legitimacy and authority of the two corporations. The thoughtful disciple learns from Anglo-Catholicism principles which teach him that to continue in the Church of England is to remain outside of the Church of Christ; thereupon he carries out the lesson of unreasoning obedience, which has been diligently inculcated upon him as the essence of piety; and resolves to submit to the true Church first, and then inquire for and believe her doctrines afterwards. The Romanist and the Anglo-Catholic concur in warning him at the peril of his soul against trusting his reason in religious matters except for one single act of private judgment: our reason was endowed with spiritual light, say they, for the single purpose of discerning the notes of the true Church. He has learnt from Anglo-Catholic teaching what those notes are: his reason shows him that the Church of England does not possess them—that they apply to the Church of Rome only. His duty becomes plain and peremptory: he must get safety (where alone it is to be had) in the one true Church. Why should views of doctrine embarrass him? The apparent reasonableness of Protestant opinions may be the effect of that separation from Christ which alarms him: and the apparent absurdity of Catholic dogma may be imputable to the blindness of that reason, from which he has been instructed by his Anglo-Catholic pastor never to accept his creed. When a man has once been persuaded that religion depends on the authority of the Church—and this is the Anglo-Catholic teaching—he will be little influenced by doctrine in determining which is the true Church: and instead of judging of the tree by its fruits—of the Christian character of a Church by the faith it professes—he may possibly rather be attracted by the very repulsiveness of its doctrine, as a proof of its mission to subjugate the understanding by supernatural truth.

‘Why,—in spite of enormous doctrinal differences,’—asks the Duke of Argyll,—‘is Rome the only refuge to which men leaving you are forced to go? Simply because, on the principles from which they start, the authority of a priesthood is more essential than the truth of its doctrinal teaching—or, which comes to the same thing—the truth can only be judged of under the guidance of its authority.’

These facts enable us to perceive that the source of the mischief is that theory of ecclesiastical polity which is commonly known by the name of Church Principles. This is the lever with which Anglo-Catholics pull down the Protestant fabric of the Church of England; this the instrument by which they enrich Rome with spoils gathered from her communion. Church Principles, we are aware, is a comprehensive term, including certain views of theology as well as of ecclesiastical polity: in

using the phrase, we restrict its meaning to the latter element only, as being the cause of the defections we are deploring. Church Principles, so understood, determine the relation of each man to Christ by his relation to the Church; and then define the Church by such marks as destroy the legitimacy of the Church of England. The Tractarian movement had for its leading object the inculcation of this ecclesiastical theory. It is the very core and essence of Tractarianism. On its first appearance the movement seemed to aim only at asserting the inherent independence of the Church; but it did this on principles which involved a great deal more. It might have taken up the same ground as the Free Church of Scotland and the Archbishop of Dublin, which was a ground perfectly consistent with Protestantism, furnishing for the foundation of the Church's independence the natural propriety and expediency of a Christian Society managing its affairs by an organisation of its own. The Tractarians preferred to build on the basis of the doctrine of a Christian priesthood and the apostolical succession; and two types successively displayed themselves in their architecture. The first process was Anglo-Catholicism, which proceeded to alter and re-model the old edifice, pulling out many stones from its foundations, and substituting for them others hewn out of the quarry of tradition and priestly supremacy. The more intelligent, however, soon perceived that the ancient fabric had thus been loosened, and that, being no longer safe or stable, it threatened to crush them beneath its ruins: so they resolved to clear it away altogether, and replace it by a building of foreign materials and architecture. In other words, Tractarianism developed the Anglo-Catholic theory of Church Principles; and then its best men pronounced it untenable within the Church of England. Most painful was the struggle; every resource which genius, learning, ability, and deep love could command, was vigorously used to obtain stability of intellectual conviction and quietness of conscience within the Church of their birth: slowly, reluctantly, in not a few instances amidst intense anguish, they came to the conclusion that the Church of England could not stand the test of Church Principles. They saw at last that, if Church Principles were true, no honest seeker for a Church founded on those principles could consistently remain within the Church of England. The competency of these men to try and judge this great question no one can gainsay. Loving sons of their first mother, reverential and even passionate admirers of her services and her doctrine, creators of an organised party which expounded and defended the Anglo-Catholic theory with an energy and dialectical



talent perhaps unrivalled since the days of Plato; cheered by the enthusiastic support of an ever-increasing host of disciples, successful, to the astonishment of all the world, against the strongest tendencies of our age, and rapidly becoming the chiefs morally, if not hierarchically, of the English clergy,—Newman and his fellow-seceders had every human motive for continuing in that Church in which they were so great, and every qualification for carrying out Anglo-Catholicism to victory and triumph.

Si Pergama dextrâ

‡ Defendi possent, etiam hæc defensa fuissent.

No other cause can be conceived for abandoning a position so dear to natural and religious feeling, except utter despair of reconciling their principles with those of the Church of England. The more profoundly they felt the spirit of those principles, the more irresistibly were they impelled to abandon a Church which contradicted them: Upon Church Principles they judged that the Church of England was not the Church of Christ: we re-echo the judgment, and we say that they judged rightly, and that the authority of the sentence thus pronounced binds every logical and consistent Anglo-Catholic to give up his principles, or to follow them out to Rome.

We shall now proceed to show the correctness of this sentence by an examination of the Anglo-Catholic theory. It boasts to be Anti-Protestant, and it gets rid of the principles of Protestantism by the substitution of others which are their logical and spiritual contradictories. Now, the two cardinal principles of Protestantism, which, at the Reformation, overthrew the Church of Rome and are the foundation of every Protestant Church, are these: the sole and paramount supremacy of the Word of God, as interpreted by private judgment; and the inherent right of every separate society of Christians throughout the world to institute for itself its own form of Church government. Protestantism does not assert that all forms of ecclesiastical polity are equally good, nor that the judgment of any one man is as trustworthy as another's in the exposition of Scripture; but it does maintain that the faith professed by each Church rests ultimately on the interpretation which that Church has, independently for itself, put upon Revelation, and that the full participation in the benefits of Christianity is not attached to any particular form of Church government. The negation of these two propositions is the essence of Anglo-Catholicism; and the question to be decided is, whether they are embodied in the constitution of the Church of England.

It is of the utmost importance to confine the discussion to this issue. The Anglo-Catholic constantly strives to divert attention from this cardinal point, by contrasting Protestant theology with the so-called Catholic doctrines; such as the sacramental theory, the absolution of priests, and the like. He finds it easier to paint in glowing colours the creed of the fourth and succeeding centuries, than to give a clear and cogent reason why we are bound to adopt it on the sole ground of authority; indeed, he is ever very impatient of being asked for such a reason. Yet this is the one vital point of the controversy. Catholicism or Protestantism is right precisely according as such a reason can or cannot be given. Assent is demanded to Catholic doctrines by both Romanists and Anglo-Catholics in the name and on the authority of the Church, independently of any insight of the understanding into their truth. In this case then, it is clearly our primary obligation to ask, what the Church is, and what is its title to lay down authoritatively the standard of religious truth.

What then is the Anglo-Catholic theory of the Church? It teaches that there is one Universal and Apostolic Church, an outward and visible society, whose essential characteristic is unity. Membership with this Church is the condition for obtaining the privileges of the Christian religion, of which the sacraments are the chief. These sacraments are possessed exclusively by the Church; and to it Christ has also given power and authority to declare the truth. Moreover, Christ has instituted in this Church a special corporation, perpetuating itself by the specific and inviolable law of succession from the Apostles through episcopal ordination and imposition of hands; and this order of men are first, priests, mediating between Christ and His people, with the right and power of sacrificing, dispensing the sacraments, absolving, and judging of doctrine; and, secondly, the sole legitimate rulers and governors of the Christian Church. Such are the main elements of the Anglo-Catholic theory. It holds much in common with the Roman; although it fails utterly in some of the essential requirements, which Rome early saw to be necessary for constituting a consistent and logical whole, and which with unscrupulous courage she has claimed and assumed in her doctrine of ecclesiastical polity. This is so indisputable, that, instead of wondering that so many of the English clergy who have embraced this theory of the Church pass on into the Church of Rome, our wonder is that any should have stopped upon the road. For there is in truth no half-way house. And if the premises of the necessity of such a Church with any such attributes are once granted, there

is no escape from the straightforward arguments of Bossuet, in his *Conférence avec M. Claude, Ministre de Charenton, sur la Matière de l'Eglise*. 'Il ne faut que savoir qu'elle est celle qu'on ne peut jamais accuser de s'être formée en se séparant; celle qu'on trouve avant toutes les séparations; celle dont toutes les autres se sont séparées.' Arguing upon these admissions, Bossuet claims no superiority for himself in the discussion, but what is common to the most ignorant Catholic over the most subtle Protestant: 'Je soutiens au contraire, que cet avantage est tellement dans notre cause, que tout ministre, tout docteur, tout homme vivant succombera de la même sorte à de pareils arguments.'

Now, in respect of the claim of exclusive right to all these prerogatives thus advanced for Episcopacy, we assert emphatically that the burden of proof lies clearly and undeniably on the Romanist and the Anglo-Catholic. No one disputes that the Roman and English Churches possess a lawful government, or that their clergy are lawful ministers of Christ. But when it is pretended that the Episcopal is the only true Church; that its clergy alone are true ministers; that every other Christian society is without a lawful ministry, a lawful government, and lawful sacraments; then there arises a manifest obligation to produce a charter conferring such exclusive titles; an explicit, positive, peremptory charter. Nothing short of such a charter can bar out Protestantism; for Protestantism being a vindication for the whole Christian community of rights which confessedly belong to it, unless appropriated to others by a distinct and positive enactment, is *necessarily* the true theory of Church polity, so long as such an enactment is not produced. The same law applies to ecclesiastical as to civil society: *melior est conditio defendentis*. The right of each Society to govern itself needs no proof; it holds good till it can be shown that a superior authority has taken it away. A Church may choose to govern itself according to the apostolical model, be it Episcopal or Presbyterian, not feeling itself at liberty to make any change in what has received direct apostolical sanction and may be presumed to be an emanation from apostolical wisdom; but, in the absence of a direct apostolical command, it cannot do this on the ground of exclusive right, so as to unchurch other Churches which have not retained that model. Apostolical precedent may be an excellent recommendation in favour of an ecclesiastical polity; but the obligatory character of that precedent for all times, its exclusive legitimacy, its suitability to the circumstances of any particular age, are all questions lying within the discretion and determination of each Christian

community. The divine right of kings or bishops can be sustained by express charter alone: none such could be found for kings, and the doctrine has been exploded from the civil world. The exhibition of such a charter alone can save episcopacy from the same fate. And such a charter must not consist of mere presumptions and possibilities: it must convey an explicit and absolute title, derived either from the positive declaration of Christ and His Apostles, or else by *necessary* deduction from the very nature itself of the Christian religion.

The Romanists felt that the demand could not be evaded: but they also found it impossible to procure such a charter from Scripture upon the principles of the ordinary interpretation of language. They next appealed to the practice and belief of antiquity; but neither did these bear out their claims with the distinctness and positiveness required. An endless amount of vague and obscure statements, and yet more the strongest diversity of opinions, presented themselves in the writings of ancient Christians. There still remained the vexatious necessity for producing an objective standard, a principle of selection: the definite and peremptory charter was still not forthcoming. The doctrine of Infallibility could alone fill up the gap in the argument and supply what was needed; and with true logical and practical instinct the Church of Rome boldly and unreservedly pronounced itself infallible. This infallibility furnishes the requisite rules for the unerring interpretation of Scripture and tradition; and the interpretation thus determined is easily made to furnish every title-deed necessary for the Church. Private judgment and the freedom of individual thought are effectively got rid of. An infallible oracle silences diversity of interpretation: to differ is to rebel, and is met, not with argument and refutation, but with chastisement and expulsion.

The logical unity of this theory is perfect: its issue with Protestantism simple and direct. Catholicism or Protestantism is established, according as the tremendous claim of infallibility is established or overthrown. In the assertion of that infallibility, however, the Romanist has firm, logical standing-ground. The Protestant treats Popery as a gross corruption of Christianity; the Roman Catholic rebuts the charge by pleading supernatural revelation as the authority for his religion. The controversy thus ultimately turns on the evidence which can be produced for a fact; and whilst the Protestant pronounces that fact to be most gratuitously assumed and to be utterly destitute of proof, the Roman Catholic may still reply that to *his* understanding the evidence for it is satisfactory.

Far otherwise is it with the unfortunate Anglo-Catholic.

The denial of infallibility puts him out of court. Many a wistful glance have Anglo-Catholics cast towards infallibility; and frequent have been their attempts to insinuate, for they dared not to affirm, the tenet. The Church of England rejects it. In her articles she proclaims the fact that the Church has erred. Her separation from Rome, and the Anglo-Catholic's un-Catholic isolation from almost all Episcopal Christendom, rest on the declaration that the Church has been fallible. Every member of the Church of England, therefore, is debarred from the use of that argument without which the long array of the ablest controversialists which the world has seen has found the proof of Church Principles impossible. Need any thing more be said to show the hopelessness of the Anglo-Catholic's position? He cannot get his proof from Scripture; he must try to extract it from the Primitive Church; but to do this he is compelled to employ the very principles which the Church theory was framed to exclude. He must be a Protestant, and act as a Protestant, and work with the Protestant instrument of private judgment, in order to obtain from the chaos of ancient writings a doctrine which shall cast out Protestantism and all its processes as false and Anti-Christian.

Here we might take our stand, and regard the Protestant doctrine as fully established by the absence of every thing like an exclusive charter for Episcopacy. Nothing more is required to prove that an Episcopal Church possesses no superior right over any other, and that the doctrines of the Anglican Church are based upon an act of private judgment (whether performed by individuals or a body of clergymen), which declares them to be consonant with the Word of God. But we will go further, and will show that the Church of England is by positive act, by her history and constitution, distinctly committed to the two cardinal principles of the Protestant doctrine of ecclesiastical polity.

In applying the Catholic theory to the Church of England, we are at once met by the startling fact that she is not in communion with the other branches of the Episcopal Church: that unity, the great note signified by the glorious title of Catholic, is wanting. We next discover that this unity did exist at a former period: that the Church of England broke it by an act of separation, when she withdrew her allegiance from that divine corporation of which she formed a part, and erected herself into an isolated and independent Church. This mighty event, the Reformation, the Church of England solemnly recognises to be her charter, whilst it is denounced by the Church from which she broke away as schism and rebellion. Now as this

latter society is acknowledged by Anglo-Catholics to be indisputably a part of the true Church, and as it possesses an overwhelming majority of that united episcopate which ruled the united Church previously to the Reformation, it is extremely difficult for the Anglo-Catholic to repel this sentence of schism and rebellion, upon the doctrine of One Universal and Visible Church. Accordingly the Reformation has been all along a stumbling block of offence to Anglo-Catholics. Every effort is made to disparage its importance. It is denied to have been a Revolution: to have formed a constitutional era in the English Church; to have originated a new government, or established new principles, or founded new rights. It is painted as a passing outburst of violence; as a transitory suspension of the regular order of the ecclesiastical world, similar to the parenthesis of the Commonwealth in the civil history of this country. But, alas! the analogy soon fails. The interruption of the Monarchy was succeeded by its restoration; whilst the results of the Reformation continue. The new dynasty created by it still rules the Church of England. She isolated herself from the Universal Episcopate then, and she is isolated still. The Reformation, therefore, odious as is the task, and irreconcilable as it is with the Catholic theory, must be justified; for how else can the sanction of legitimacy be obtained for that constitution which the Reformation called into existence, and whose legality the Anglo-Catholic is compelled to profess? He is, therefore, obliged to do two things. He has first to make out the Reformation to have been a formal and regular act of the divinely appointed authorities of the Church: and he must modify the theory of unity and of the Catholic Church in such a manner as shall make it fit with the altered form which the Church of England received on that occasion.

First, then, he must transform the Reformation from a Revolution into a Reform Bill. The favourite engine by which this conversion is effected is an artful insisting on the identity of the English Church before and after the Reformation. The Anglo-Catholic asserts that one and the same Anglican Church has existed ever since the time when Christianity was first introduced into Britain: that consequently that Church was in no sense the child of the Reformation: that her purity, indeed, and her independence had been compromised by the usurpation and oppression of her sister Church of Rome: but that she became awakened to a sense of her doctrinal and ecclesiastical degradation, and with a noble energy, and by an act carried out in her own name, and by her own Apostolic right, effected her restoration. This statement, however plausible it may sound, is

delusive: for under cover of an ambiguity it begs the very question at issue. There are two senses in which the identity of the English Church may be asserted. According to one of these senses, there is an identity of the Christian people, of the Christian society before and after the Reformation. That event was not a conversion from heathenism to Christianity: but a change in the government, and an alteration of the creed, of a pre-existing Christian community. The community itself, the body of Christians of whom it was composed, remained the same: the men who made up the Reformed Church of England were the same men as had constituted the Roman Catholic Church of England. This identity is contested by no one: it is affirmed by the Anglo-Catholic; and is the very key-stone of the Protestant's argument. For the real question to be determined is the legitimacy of the Church of England and its source. The Protestant builds his Church on the exercise by the Christian society of England of its right to govern itself: the pre-existence, therefore, of a body who could exercise such a right is necessary to the proof of its actual exercise. Had the Church of England been founded at the Reformation, like the primitive churches, by missionaries, who also organised its government, the Protestant might not have had it in his power to appeal to a distinct assertion, on the part of English Christians, of their prerogative of framing an ecclesiastical constitution for themselves: but precisely because there was such a continuous Christian society, and also a radical change in its constitution, he is entitled to maintain that the new government did not derive its authority from the sanction or decree of its predecessor. He may now proclaim with confidence that the Reformation asserted in the ecclesiastical the same truths which centuries later civil revolutions have established and are establishing in the secular world,—the nullity, namely, of divine right and the supreme sovereignty of society over all its concerns and relations. In both cases the process is the same; and in both the identity of the society whose government was altered is the logical condition of the inference that, in the absence of all other title, the will of the society to be thus governed alone imparts legitimacy to the new order of things.

The identity, then, of the English Church, in this sense of the word, will not save the Anglo-Catholic theory or the divine right of Episcopacy; for this identity is the ground-work of the opposite doctrine. But it suggests a second and very different meaning, which conveys a thoroughly false notion, though well suited to the Anglo-Catholic's purpose. This insinuated identity is identity of government; a strict and unbroken continuity of the rul-

ing authority, whereby the new institutions obtain the sanction of lawful and duly authorised power. Thus the Anglo-Catholic derives the legitimacy of the doctrine and constitution of his Church from the sanction of an established corporation, to which he alleges the high commission of ruling and teaching has been exclusively delegated by Christ. That corporation, he says, has been the sole fountain of legality and right in the English Church, from its earliest existence down to this day: and the Reformation was the work of this divine legislature. Many grievous obligations are hereby imposed on the Anglo-Catholic. Like the Romanist, he is first of all bound to prove that Christ formally deprived each Christian community of its natural right, as an organised society, to govern itself, and vested the supreme rule of faith and conduct in a special and self-perpetuating corporation. We have seen that for sustaining this claim the production of a peremptory charter is indispensable; and that no such charter has been or can be produced. But supposing this difficulty to be removed, the Anglo-Catholic is next bound to prove that this divine corporation is not one integral body, issuing its decrees in its collective capacity for all Christendom, with some central organ of unity, of whatever kind; but is an aggregate of separate and isolated parts, each part possessing completely all the powers attached to the corporation: and having proved this he must go on to show, that all that was done in England at the Reformation was done by the locally supreme government of the English Episcopate. He must maintain that the Catholic Church is an assemblage of co-ordinate national unities, each sovereign within its own sphere of action; and then further, that the reformed constitution of the Church of England, her separation from the Church of which she formed a part, her articles, her laws, her tribunals, were all the products of regular and deliberate enactment by her divinely instituted rulers.

Both these propositions are unfounded, and incapable of being defended. Such a description of the organisation of the Church is, as we shall show presently, incompatible with the Catholic theory: and the assertion that the Reformation was the work of the English clergy is as ridiculous as it is historically untrue. No historical fact is more certain than that the reformed faith and new constitution of the English Church were forced upon the clergy by a power which they had neither the strength nor the courage to resist. The Reformation was carried against their will, in spite of their opposition, and in defiance of their convictions. The terrors alone of a *præmunire* coerced them into the admission of the revolutionary principle that the King's Majesty is, under God, the Supreme Head and Governor of the



Church of England. It was King, Lords, and Commons, who denounced the usurpation of the Pope, and severed this realm and Church from his dominion. The Bishops, the successors of the Apostles, were almost to a man opposed to the revolution in religion: and their opinions in favour of the old doctrines remain on record to this day. The present model of the Church of England owes its birth, in the reign of Edward VI., to Acts of Parliament, and to Royal Commissions issued under the authority of statutes passed by that King and his father. The Statute 31 Henry 8. gave the King and his son power to issue proclamations about religion: and 'this,' says Dr. Cardwell, 'was the foundation of the great changes in religion in 'the nonage of Edward VI.' Royal visitations and injunctions in the same reign, unsanctioned by any spiritual authority, effected numerous and most important innovations in religion. Act of Parliament in 1547 alone ordered the giving of the cup to the laity. The Ordination Service, a most vital part of the English ritual, was an emanation from the King's pleasure and private judgment, for it came forth from a committee of six prelates and six others *nominated by the King*, under a power conferred by Parliament. Parliament further commanded that this service, when put forth under the Great Seal, should be alone used: and the Bishop of Worcester, one of this committee, was committed to the Fleet by the King's Council, 'because he obstinately denied to subscribe the book 'for making of bishops and priests.' It was Parliament which conferred on 'the King, his heirs and successors, power to visit 'and reform all heresies, errors and abuses, which in the spiritual 'jurisdiction ought to be reformed.' The State, that is Parliament, made the Crown, in the Court of Delegates—a body which was to be chosen, at the King's pleasure, from any class of men, lay or clerical, without limitation—supreme judge of doctrine and of every ecclesiastical cause, with power to judge and deprive any bishop or archbishop, for heresy, or any other spiritual offence. That Court of Delegates, thus instituted by the State alone, continued to be, down to our own day, the highest spiritual tribunal of the Church of England: and it was the same authority of the State alone which substituted for it the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, with an equally extensive jurisdiction, except so far as it has been restricted by the law of the land. The clause of the Twentieth Article, which ascribes to the Church 'power to decree rites or ceremonies and authority in controversies of faith,' was added by the authority and command of Queen Elizabeth alone, and did not even obtain the sanction of Parliament, when the articles were

ratified in the thirteenth year of her reign. The Prayer Book itself, so dear to Anglo-Catholics as the Palladium of English Catholicity, had no other authority for a century than the private judgment of Parliament; and but for the political accident of the existence of the Commonwealth, which disestablished the English Church and compelled its re-enactment at the restoration of the Monarchy, would have remained to this day without the sanction of Convocation. And, lastly and decisively, when the Church of England was formally constituted by the Act of Uniformity of Elizabeth, the whole Episcopate, save one, refused to recognise that Church, and preferred to lose their sees rather than authorise her legitimacy and her faith.

These facts are decisive. It is certain that the reform of the Church of England was *not* the act of the English Episcopate, and that the opinions and the authority of that divine corporation, from which alone the Anglo-Catholic derives ecclesiastical legitimacy, were utterly overruled and set at nought in the constructing of that Church. And the conclusion is irresistible, that either the Church of England is no Church at all, or else that the lawfulness of that, as well as of all other Churches, must flow from some other source than the existence and the sanction of a divinely appointed instrument of government.

In order to parry this fatal blow, the Anglo-Catholic sometimes replies, that no prejudice can accrue to the title of a regular authority from the oppression of an external and illegal force. Granted: but neither must the acts and appointments of that illegal violence be accepted as legitimate. Violence can never confer legitimacy. Institutions originally set up by violence are often sanctioned afterwards by the acquiescence of society and by their *de facto* establishment and discharge of the functions of government. If this title is rejected, and the silent ratification of the governed is denied to be an authority capable of imparting complete legitimacy, then the institutions remain as illegal as they were on the day of their revolutionary creation, and it will be the duty of every man to restore the previous state of things as quickly as possible. The Anglo-Catholic, therefore, is welcome to repudiate the authority of the revolution carried out at the Reformation, if he will fairly accept the conclusion involved in his premises, that the Church of England, the Church of this day to which he belongs, is incapable of defence upon the Catholic theory—that her articles, her formularies, and her doctrines, have no other foundation than the will and private judgment of an oppressor and usurper—and that it is the duty of every Englishman to return to that Romish communion from which violence and revolution alone expelled him.

More frequently, however, the Anglo-Catholic insists on the ratification given subsequently by Convocation to the acts of the Reformation. This defence is equally worthless. It begs the question. Convocation must first establish its own legitimacy before it can claim authority to enact a change of government. First of all, it must show that both *de jure* and *de facto* it was all along the one sole and lawful organ of government of the English Church. Will even the Anglo-Catholic undertake the proof of this proposition? But let us waive for a moment our objection to the title of Convocation. We know that whatever sanction Convocation gave to the new institutions before the reign of Elizabeth — and it was partial only, extending to but a few of the proceedings of the Reformers — it gave under coercion and against the religious opinions of the Episcopate generally. It is clear that to accept such a sanction as conferring legitimacy, would be to reduce the divine rule of Episcopacy to a hollow sham: for what could be the value of the authority imparted to a new organisation of the Church and new formularies of faith by men who held that organisation to be a rebellion, and that faith to be false and contrary to Catholic truth? And as to the confirmation given by Convocation in the reigns of Elizabeth and Charles II., it is more worthless still: for it amounts to nothing more than a declaration of their own legitimacy and orthodoxy by the very men whom the Revolution had raised to office and power in the place of the lawful rulers, whom it had driven out by force. What would the assertion by William III. and his Parliament, that they were the lawful governors of this realm, have been worth, *upon the principles of divine right*, against the claim of James II. and his son?

We have now shown that the Church of England did not receive *de facto* her polity and her creed from the divine oracle of the Episcopate, but from the private judgment of the Christian society as represented in Parliament: and we arrive at the important conclusion that she is not built on a foundation of Church Principles, but on the Protestant dogma of the inherent right of every Church to shape its own Church government for itself. We now go further, and assert that *de jure* the clerical hierarchy, even if it had had the will and the power, would not have had the right upon Church Principles, of separating itself from the community of which it had formed a part. The English Episcopate, an insignificant minority, severed itself from the vast majority of the Catholic Episcopate. Minorities refusing submission to majorities must of necessity take their stand on some principle higher than the authority of the whole

collective body. To what principle then does the Anglo-Catholic appeal?

Let us suppose the Episcopate to have assembled in holy Synod, deeply convinced of the corruption of Rome, and firmly resolved to shake it off. They are Anglo-Catholics: whatever they do, they must preserve Catholic principles inviolate. By what ingenuity shall they dispel the fearful perplexity which meets them at the outset of their deliberations? How shall they find a principle, which shall condemn the majority of Apostolical bishops of error, shall justify a breach of an established unity, and yet shall save them from falling headlong into the Protestant abyss of private judgment? To the bar of what tribunal shall they summon the Church of Rome? Not to that of truth and reason: for it is a court fatal to the accusers and the accused alike. The Bible lies open before them: the folios of tradition are at hand: but where and who is the interpreter? How answer this trying question—and answer it they must, before they can get a basis for their proceedings—and yet keep the Catholic faith? How condemn Rome without demolishing the Catholic theory altogether? They hold that there is One Universal Church: how can they rend it into fragments and destroy one by conversion into many? for this is the import of what they are doing. They are not excommunicating heretics—a sentence which Rome will soon fulminate against them with perfect consistency of logic; *that* were an easy matter compared with splitting the catholicity of churches acknowledged to be apostolical. At the very moment when they are breaking away from Rome, they call her a true and living member of Christ: are they not, therefore, dividing *His* mystical body into pieces? Gerson and Pierre d'Aillé, and other illustrious reformers, purified the Christian world by General Assemblies of the Catholic Church: why not appeal to such a judge? Alas, they know that the forthcoming English Church, with her articles and her headship vested in the civil power, can never obtain the sanction of an Œcumenical Council. And even such an authority, if obtained, might be excepted to as insufficient: for Cranmer might remind them that 'the divines of Paris held that a Council could not make a new article of the faith that was not in the Scriptures.' In this extremity a foundation has been found for Anglo-Catholicism by a consummate master of the Catholic theory. A living bishop has proclaimed it to a real Synod.

'What was done at that time,' said recently the Bishop of Exeter, 'was plainly this, that here we had been holding errors in common with Rome. The Church of England was a Church,—it was a branch

of the Holy Catholic Church,—and every branch of the Holy Catholic Church has a right to rid itself of the errors which it formerly may have held. The Church of England did rid itself of these errors which it held in common with the Church of Rome: but as we admitted the Church of Rome to hold all the articles of the Christian faith, we did not separate ourselves from *them*. . . . It was Rome that separated from us.'

What a blow is here dealt to the Catholic theory! what a sentence of failure is passed on the institution of Christ! The divine model of government has not realised the great objects for which it was framed. The Apostolate has not kept the faith pure, nor protected Christians from error, nor preserved the Christian worship uncorrupt. The one Universal Church is admitted to have been universally in error: to have universally shared that human weakness which was supposed to have been the peculiar misfortune of Protestant principles. Who shall maintain henceforth that the Episcopal polity, which has thus signally failed, was endowed with exclusive legitimacy by Christ, and expressly too for the sake of accomplishing those great ends, truth and unity, which the chief of Anglo-Catholics admits to have been *not* accomplished?

'Every branch of the Holy Catholic Church,' says the Bishop's theory, 'has the right to rid itself of the errors which 'it may have formerly held.' What right? Protestantism maintains that not only every Church, but also every single Christian, has a right to rid himself of his errors. Is the bishop disposed to admit the extreme right of private judgment? Very far from it. His meaning is, we presume, that a single Christian would have no right to pronounce his errors to be errors: he has no power to distinguish authoritatively between truth and error. A Church alone can do that; and a branch is a full and complete Church, and may judge of the truth of doctrine and act upon its convictions. By this theory, the one Catholic Church is converted into many independent Churches: it becomes a number of branches without trunk or root; in truth no tree at all. One faith, one government, no distressing doubts between conflicting declarations of the faith, no uncertainty of interpretation, no rivalry of sects, no collision of authority, no diversities of worship,—this is the sublime unity which Catholic principles promise. And what is the substitute which the Bishop offers in the name of Anglo-Catholicism? Not unity of government, for the Church of England is a pure isolation: nor unity of worship, for what can be more diverse than the Greek, the Roman, and the English rituals?—nor unity of doctrine, for the Anglican charges all the great Episcopal Churches with

grave error, and is in turn anathematised by them as heretical : but similarity, similarity of outward structure, of form and ceremonial, coupled with a complete diversity of authority and doctrine ; episcopates resembling one another in the transmission of an external form, but holding opposite creeds, teaching antagonistic views, and launching out fierce denunciations of schism and heresy against each other. Such is the picture exhibited by independent Episcopal Churches ; and such is what Anglo-Catholicism must accept as the normal state of the one Catholic Church.

But what are these branches thus invested with co-ordinate sovereignty ? National Churches, replies the Anglo-Catholic. Is he unconscious that to erect National Churches into integral Church units involves the very essence of Protestantism ? A nation is a purely secular division, determined by geographical and political limits : and neither geography nor the State can, upon Church Principles, decompose the unity of the Episcopate into organic parts of the Church. Church Principles tell us that Christ's kingdom is not of this world : that the Church is a spiritual power, and her title derived from heaven. She owns no earthly superior within her own sphere : her constitution is divine. How then can a political and secular combination furnish the Catholic Churchman with a basis for parcelling out the spiritual power into organic elements, each element being endowed with the full prerogatives of the whole body ? How can a perfectly foreign and heterogeneous principle — the division of the world into States — take the one Catholic Church to pieces, divide its rulers into separate groups, and establish the law, that the government of this one Church and the determination of its faith are the prerogatives of each group, each severally for itself ? All limitations which emanate from the State have the State for their ground and principle : the State, and nothing else, is their authority. Upon the Anglo-Catholic theory an assembly of national bishops can be nothing more than an aggregate of so many independent persons, with no controlling or binding supremacy of a majority, with no obligation spiritual or ecclesiastical imposed on any one to submit his will and opinions to the judgment of his colleagues. If such a synod, calling itself a National Church, constitutes itself into an organic whole, and as such performs acts, not of administration only but of sovereignty, it is clear that these acts of the united body will possess only so much authority as can be conferred by the law or principle which associated them into a collective unity. That law can only be either the State, or their own schismatical erecting of themselves into a separate Church. It is impossible

therefore for the Anglo-Catholic theory to furnish a legitimate title to National Churches. They disappear under the destructive influence of that theory. Protestantism claims for National Churches, as societies of Christian men, the right of self-government: Rome recognises National Churches as subordinate organs of administration: the Anglo-Catholic alone can assign no legitimate place to a National Church,—though without a satisfactory theory of National Churches he has neither authority for his faith, nor any Church at all. Upon the Anglo-Catholic doctrine, there is not and cannot be an organic Church of England. We appeal to the Bishop of Exeter himself. In an address recently made by him to the clergy of his diocese, the Bishop says,—

‘I need not tell you that the bishop and his clergy with his people are a complete Church: perhaps in some respects more to be recognised as such than a National Church, because we all know that a Diocesan Church is the appointment of God Himself. A National Church we believe to be in full accordance with the gracious will of God, carrying out under His direction His great views: but still it is not appointed to us in Scripture. I look upon that as a human institution—upon our own Diocesan Church as a Divine institution.’

Here we have a very decisive, and, as we think, irrefutable statement, that National Churches are no constituent and organic parts of the divine polity of the Church. They are human institutions: their authority is purely human; and, as united bodies, they cannot bind a single dissentient bishop to a single doctrine, nor even to membership with their communion. What possible principle can bind him to recognise in the voice of his colleagues the oracle of God’s Church? He can plead his own divine commission received directly from Christ. His plea may be overruled so far, that he may be compelled to submit himself to a general council of *all* who have received a similar commission, as the lawful organ of unity. But what can oblige him to allow any human power, least of all the State, to combine a small number of bishops together, and to impart to such an arbitrary combination one particle of divine authority? National Churches have often been carried away by feelings and doctrines which accidental or political causes have made locally prevalent: they have again and again been condemned for heresy. Would an orthodox bishop, who refused to join in that heresy, be open to the charge of resisting God’s will as expressed by the Church? Certainly not, replies the Anglo-Catholic; he is repelling heresy. Well then, each bishop, according to this reply, is a final and *independent* judge of truth and heresy; he may resist the unanimous judgment of all his

national colleagues. But, if so, how shall the National Church be prevented from being split into as many churches as there are dioceses in the land? What is its principle of unity? Adherence to Catholic truth, the Anglo-Catholic answers: it is the duty of every bishop to adhere to it. But what is Catholic truth? how is it to be determined? By Catholic consent. But who shall say what Catholic consent has ruled? Plainly each bishop for himself, since each is authorised to call that heresy which his colleagues are propounding as truth. And this holds true of every synod from the days of the Apostles down to our own. In every age and in every Church, according to Church Principles, the private judgment of each bishop is sole and absolute judge of every thing, even of the law of doctrine itself by which his own opinions are to be tried. Can the theory of private judgment be carried farther? It is a pure mystification to talk of 'the Church' having defined the faith, or 'the Church' having settled this or that doctrine, and so on. The decrees of Œcumenical Councils are the only utterances which the Church can possibly be said to have made: and for our own parts we do not envy the man who shall undertake to prove that a real Œcumenical Council, such as the Catholic theory requires, has ever existed. But, however that may be, this much is certain, that the voice of the Church in every age, with the exception of the few decrees of such councils, if there have been any, is nothing more than the opinions of a certain number of Christians, formed by their own private judgment, or that of their bishops. Men are easily impressed by the sound of such awful abstractions as 'the Church,' and readily believe in the existence of a mysterious but substantive body, possessed of a real and definite organisation, and performing many corporate acts; but it is a pure illusion, in the sense in which it is spoken of by the Anglo-Catholic. There is a Church of Greece and of Syria and of Scotland now, as there was a Church of Jerusalem and Antioch and Ephesus of old; and there is a Church of Rome, which, by a marvellous combination of art and violence, sustained by a most astounding perseverance, has subjugated other Churches, and usurped a lawless dominion over a large part of Christendom. And there is a Catholic Church also, the great company of Christians throughout the world, of every nation and language, worshippers of the same God, believers in the same Saviour, acknowledging the same Scriptures, animated with the same hope of immortality; divided indeed into many societies, yet members of the same vast family, attesting the oneness of their brotherhood by the oneness of their common relation to Christ. But this is no organised corporation, no single institution of



government or administration; it has no common organ of rule or doctrine, and the oneness of its faith is the oneness of truth only—of truth as separately and independently, yet unitedly acknowledged by each several member of the Universal Body of Christ.

If our argument needed confirmation, we could obtain it in abundance from the Bishop of Exeter. He has not been slow to carry the Anglo-Catholic theory into execution. The contempt which he has poured on the authority of his metropolitan, the reproach of heresy with which he has scornfully branded him, his arrogant and rebellious repudiation of the highest tribunal of the Church in which he is an officer, unequivocally attest the bishop's belief in the nonentity of the Church of England, as an organic whole: whilst, by claiming for himself a veto over the decrees of the synod of the Divine Church of Exeter, he has fully established the doctrine of the absolute right of private judgment belonging to every individual bishop.

But what shall we say of the laity? what rule is to govern *their* conduct? Anglo-Catholicism cannot require the perplexed layman to commit himself unreservedly to his clerical guides, because it admits that they may be leading him only into a development of error and corruption. What is a Christian man to do who shall think that either the clergy, as in the Romish Church, are progressively corrupting the faith, or, as at the Reformation, are clinging to error, and resisting the restoration of the truth? Rome escapes these embarrassing difficulties by asserting her infallibility. 'Hear the Church,' she cries; 'it cannot err.' But, in Churches admitted to be fallible, to demand of the laity, under the name of Church Principles, unconditional submission to the guidance of the priesthood, is to make these principles represent Christ to have willed that the laity should be spiritual slaves; and that with the certainty, as the *Anglo-Catholic himself confesses*, of being often the slaves of sin and error. Can so monstrous a proposition be entertained in the face of the enormous mass of Episcopal fallibility revealed by ecclesiastical history? And if our natural and religious feelings revolt against the religion to which Christianity would be reduced by such a doctrine; if they feel that such a system does violence to the spirit which breathes in every page of the New Testament, what other alternative is there (except we take refuge in an infallible Church or Pope) than to declare moral freedom to be the basis of all piety, and to claim for every man the right and power of repelling error and embracing truth? Even Anglo-Catholicism, if pushed home, must accept this solution of the difficulty, and pronounce its own condemnation by es

establishing the right of the layman to be the ultimate and supreme judge for himself of religious truth. Christ has commanded the layman to seek the truth, and none are louder or fiercer than the Anglo-Catholics in their invectives against heresy, as fatal to the soul and destructive of salvation. Anglo-Catholicism, moreover, has warned the layman that the word and sanction of a lawful Episcopate afford no certain guarantee against heresy: and therefore Anglo-Catholicism is compelled to confer the right, nay, rather to impose the duty, on the Christian layman, if he is to obey Christ's command, of summoning his own Episcopate to the tribunal of his conscience, and deciding whether it is holding or corrupting the faith. And if he can review the doctrines held by his Episcopate, it is impossible to refuse him the further right of determining in any case, whether the amount of error professed by his Church is such as may be silently submitted to, or ought to be protested against, or even got rid of by a positive secession from her communion. The higher power carries the less. To condemn a Church for heresy involves the duty, if need be, of separation from it. Anglo-Catholicism may perhaps strive to avert the conclusion so fatal to it, — that a Christian people may set up a new ministry, or that there may be more than one branch of the one Church in the same land, — by suggesting emigration to a country where a sound branch flourishes. An emigrant would be able to avail himself of what the Bishop of Exeter calls 'one of the foundations of Church communion.' 'If there is no act of idolatry,' says the Bishop, 'I hold it is the bounden duty of every Catholic Christian to communicate in the Church of the country holding the Apostolic doctrine and fellowship, wherever he is!' Emigration, therefore, would furnish a convenient escape to the layman, who was persuaded that the branch to which he belonged had fallen into 'idolatry and error:' but emigration is an impracticable remedy for a whole people. To abstain therefore from Church Communion altogether, with the loss of the sacraments and Church ordinances, — or to remain in communion with a clergy who are guilty of deadly heresy, — or to form a new branch or Church by secession, upon *both* the Protestant principles of private judgment and self-government — are the three final results yielded by the analysis of the Anglo-Catholic theory. Out of these three courses a Christian laity, under the supposed circumstances, must choose one. And the case is not imaginary. At this very day, thousands of laymen in the Greek and Romish Churches are probably convinced of the errors of their respective professions of doctrine; and ecclesiastical history ex-

hibits still more striking instances of the same phenomenon in the past. In every such case, where reform is out of the question, one of these three courses had or has to be adopted by Christian laymen: and every one of the three brings Anglo-Catholicism to a *reductio ad absurdum*.

Rome, on the other hand, with consummate shrewdness repudiates the doctrine of National Churches, knowing it to be a quicksand on which the divine institution of the Catholic Church, as understood by Church Principles, cannot fail to suffer shipwreck. She acknowledges but One Universal Church, one society, one organ of government, a real unity of subordinate, and not, as the Anglo-Catholic pretends, co-equal and independent parts. Separation from the centre of unity she accounts to be separation from the Church of Christ. 'It is a great point in our controversy with Rome,' says the Bishop of Exeter, 'that we are not the parties that shook her off, but that Rome shook us off; and it is the point by which we justify our position much more than by any other.' Anglo-Catholicism must indeed be reduced to desperate straits, if it has no better shield to oppose to the assaults of Rome. Does the veteran and acute controversialist not perceive that when it became certain that England would not submit herself again to the dominion of the Pope, Rome had no other course than to excommunicate the Church of England; that the anathema she launched forth only shows how much more true and more profound is her conception of the idea of the Catholic Church than the Anglo-Catholic's? Not to have declared the Church of England guilty of schism would have been to abandon the ground of One Universal Church, to surrender the principle of unity, and to fall into the Protestant doctrine of National Churches. Rome was true to herself and her principles; she cut off the schismatic member from her communion, feeling that a sentence of excommunication was for her a necessary attestation that she held to the idea of One Catholic Church. When the Bishop, therefore, alleges that it was Rome which separated from us, he begs the question at issue between the two Churches, by assuming that the One Catholic Church is not a single institution of government, but an aggregate of co-ordinate sovereignties. If this representation of Church Principles be true, no doubt Rome was guilty of a breach of unity and charity by excommunicating us for vindicating our national independence as Christians; but if, on the contrary, it is false, then it was England that cut Catholicity asunder by the Act of Parliament which abolished the authority of the Pope in this realm; and Rome was not only justified in

shaking off the Anglican Church, but would have betrayed the cause of Catholicity, had she failed to denounce what from her point of view she justly held to be rebellion. Her separation from the Church of England, instead of being an argument against her on Church Principles, is only a declaration on her part that the English Reformers had taken up Protestant ground, and had formally renounced the Catholic theory of the Church. The excommunication of England was the natural and necessary expression of the diversity of the views held on both sides. It is no logical refutation of Rome, nor any justification of Anglo-Catholicism, at the bar of Church Principles; it simply tells the Anglo-Catholic that Rome does not accept his theory of National Churches. Granted that the doctrine of National Churches is the true exposition of Church Principles, the breach of unity will rest with the Church of Rome; but, on the other hand, granted that this doctrine is Protestant to the very core, the responsibility of the separation falls wholly on the Church of England.

We know the Bishop of Exeter to be a clear and subtle debater, but we confess, were we Anglo-Catholics, we should tremble for the issue of a controversy which began with the admission that 'we did not renounce Rome, but we renounced Rome's errors.' He comforts himself with the thought that he has Bishop Jewel to support him, assuring us, at the same time, with much *naïveté*, that the great Reformer made the same admission 'in the strongest possible way, and that it is the foundation upon which his Apology for the Church of England rests.' Is it that he chooses to ignore, or that he has yet to discover, that Jewel was a good Protestant, that he went to his Bible, and comparing the teaching of Rome with the teaching of Scripture, found them to be discordant; and preferring the Word of God to that of man, performed a sound act of private judgment, and cast off the errors of Rome? Does he think that he will get help from Jewel in his defence of Church Principles, when he shall be challenged by the Romanists to state what authority 'our bishops had for meeting and saying, "There are certain errors which we renounce?"' Bishop Jewel's answer would be easy and Protestant, that of Bishop Philpotts would not be easy; we have proved that it would not be equally Protestant in essence; and we fear he would find it impossible to show cause why he should not either give up the theory of Church Principles, or renounce a Church which has cleared them away from her foundations.

In conclusion, we wish to say a few words in reply to an objection we have sometimes heard; that by exposing the

hollowness of Anglo-Catholicism, we drive fresh converts to Rome. We do not deny that such an effect may be produced occasionally; but we hold that no danger which could arise from convincing men that their present position is untenable is to be compared with the very serious mischief which would be caused by the impression gaining ground, that the theory of Church Principles was incapable of refutation. The evil is too widely spread and too actively propagated to admit of being safely left to the silent good sense of the country. Some support too is due to the many who have to fight the battle within their own homes; some security should be provided for those who tremble for the defection of those they love best, first to Anglo-Catholicism and then to Rome. Moreover, there are not a few who would be saved from this fate, if they could be made to perceive, whilst their minds are still unbiassed, the full consequences involved in surrendering themselves to Anglo-Catholic teaching; many would embrace their Protestantism more firmly, and yield themselves to its principles with confidence, if they distinctly understood that a *Via Media* was a delusion, and that every man must either take his stand on Protestant principles or take refuge in the belief of an infallible Church. It is a matter of incalculable importance that it should be seen that neither the laws of Christ and His Church, nor those of the human understanding, admit of any third alternative. And lastly, if a justification is sought for what we have done, we can produce an admirable one in the solemn and wise, and instructive words of the Duke of Argyll.

‘It is not simply that whatever errors may arise in such a Church (a Church founded on Church Principles) are stereotyped by authority, so that each becomes the basis of a new and more gross corruption: but it is that the Romish system of priesthood stands mentally and morally in close connexion with the Romish system of belief. It is, indeed, conceivable that such a priesthood might start with teaching a very pure and spiritual faith; but it is hardly conceivable that such a teaching should be long retained.\* It is impossible that such mechanical ideas of the structure and government of Christ’s Church should not necessarily involve ideas equally mechanical of the nature and requirements of His religion. If there be such an outward visible presence in the world to which such powers are given, numerous and eager calls will be made upon its assistance and protection. Men will be delighted to find that they may walk by sight and not by faith — that is to say, by trust in men and things which they can see and follow, rather than by faith in things which are invisible and by conscious apprehension of their influence. Thus the people will be well pleased to magnify the office of the priest, and the priesthood will be ready to return the comforts which that office enables them to dispense. A bargain, as it were, is thus struck between them, from

which both parties appear to gain. This is the very base line from which the Church of Rome has conducted its operations — this is the very essence of the condition of mind out of which the whole system of Romanism, in its worst features, was but a natural and inevitable growth. It is impossible that a reformed faith should be maintained in its most vital principles under the combined influences thus brought to bear both upon the priest and the people. . . . May the Church of England be saved from the consequences which that connexion (of the Romish doctrines with the ecclesiastical principles sanctioned in the Bishop of Oxford's Protest) threatens—by its nature and consequences being seen and understood *in time*.'

We cannot conclude this Article without expressing our cordial respect for the earnestness and depth of conviction, and our high admiration for the ability and sustained energy, with which the Duke of Argyll carries out the advocacy of Protestant principles. The Pamphlet, whose title we have prefixed to this paper, is as remarkable for the mental power it displays as for the soundness of its views and its insight into religious truth: exhibiting a most refreshing contrast with the other, with which we have associated it. By such weapons alone can the progress of Popery be repelled: and it must cheer all to whom the cause of Scriptural religion, and of moral and spiritual independence is dear, to find themselves so efficiently supported in its defence by one who combines great intellectual vigour with a warm faith in Protestant principles, and a manly fearlessness in avowing them.

---

ART. IX. — *Official Catalogue of the Great Exhibition of the Works of Industry of all Nations, 1851.* By Authority of the Royal Commission. Fourth corrected and improved edition, 15th September, 1851. London: Spicer Brothers, Wholesale Stationers; W. Clowes & Sons, Printers; Contractors to the Royal Commission. Price 1s. in the Building, Hyde Park, or 1s. 3d. at the City Office, 29, New Bridge Street, Blackfriars.

THIS volume may be said to bring down the history of Industrial Science from a period indefinitely remote to the very eve of its own publication: its teachings, like those of Biography, are by examples; it addresses itself to all our natural and artificial wants. Would you know where the richest ores, the costliest jewels, the largest diamonds or the rarest gems are to be sought; where the finest flax, wool, cotton — where the

most useful inventions of every kind—the delicate balance that turns at the  $\frac{1}{1000}$ th of a grain, and the huge cross-beam that plays with the Britannia Tube are to be found—you must consult its pages. You will there learn where the choicest specimens of all and each of these—the master productions of nature and intellect—were assembled on a recent day,—where produced,—where fashioned, and by whom. With the impending dispersion of the collection which it chronicles, its curt descriptions,—though they assume somewhat of the elegiac character of the epitaph,—lose little of their intrinsic value. The bygone activity of the collective laboratories, libraries, and workshops of the world seem here transmuted into the pages of one small quarto volume.

Quid juvat innumeris impleri scrinia libris;  
Unus pro cunctis—*parvulus* esse potest.

The form of its publication is in character with a range of subject so discursive. Published simultaneously in two places—at differing prices, by two unhomogeneous and abnormal publishers,—it is issued ‘by authority,’ and furnished by ‘contract.’ A very *Ornithorhynchus paradoxus* of literature, combining the body of an Encyclopædia with the feet of the most ubiquitous of guides. Its earlier editions were consulted with the same feeling of despondency with which one is wont to search the rubrics of that kindred sphinx of railway locomotion—Bradshaw—and in general with the like results.

Into the causes of this inceptive ambiguity, it is now needless to enter. The present edition is in a great measure free from the peculiarities which marked those that preceded it. When, however, Dutch contributors promise ‘iron fire-offices,’ that eventually prove to be fire-proof safes,—French chemists send mint, ‘crystallised and peppered,’ or ‘cherry-cake’ which by a mistake of *cerise* for *ceruse*, turns out to be white lead, or our American neighbours promise a ‘horse-power’ or ‘power-loom ‘lathe’—it is not easy for an editor to be at once complying and intelligible. Catalogues are seldom models of accuracy. The world has been amused before now with finding a mathematical work, ‘De Calculo,’ and ‘Burton’s Anatomy of Melancholy,’ ranged under the head of ‘Medical.’ And indeed, as in the opinion of Barante, there was nothing about Madame de Genlis natural—except her children,—so there seems to be nothing half so natural about the volume before us—as its blunders. Few, however, who have enjoyed the privilege of consulting the original manuscripts, could have felt surprise, had the failure been even still more glaring. We are all aware of the difficulties of correct defi-

nition. And it was little probable that anticipatory descriptions of probable achievements should not partake largely of a speculative character. The collective idiosyncrasies of eighteen thousand individuals of every class and nation, will always need indulgence. But could access be still had to the original documents, we feel perfectly assured that no body of evidence on the existing state of education among the producing classes — not only of this country, but throughout the world — could be obtained, more curious in itself or more characteristic of their mental habitudes, than that supplied by the original ‘applications for space,’ forwarded by the candidate exhibitors.

The statistics of this volume throw light upon the producing capabilities of our great printing establishments. From information supplied by the contractors, it would seem, that although the first complete impressions were only attainable at ten o'clock on the night preceding the 1st of May, yet 10,000 copies properly stitched and bound were duly delivered at the building in Hyde Park on the following morning. The two copies presented to Her Majesty and the Prince on that occasion had been furnished with their rich trappings of morocco and gold within six hours. The sale of this book, equal in quantity of matter to four ordinary octavo volumes, and published at less than the price of one, has been proportionately large. Upwards of 250,000 copies, about one-sixth of the estimated number of printed volumes that issued from the printing press within the three first centuries after the discovery of the Art of Printing, have been sold. The quantity of paper thus consumed amounted to one hundred and five tons, and the duty paid thereon to the sum of one thousand four hundred and sixty pounds; fifty-two thousand pounds weight of metal are employed in the type, which is kept constantly ‘set up,’ in order to make all needful alterations. These figures are so large, that we find it difficult to discover any middle term to bring the results they indicate home to our minds. But it may perhaps assist the imagination to reflect that if from any reason, or, indeed, many reasons, the whole of the earlier editions had been consigned in one vertical column to the bosom of the Pacific Ocean, the depth of the latter being generally estimated at 6000 feet, the present improved and correct edition would still form a lonely peak rising to the height of Chimborazo or Cotopaxi, exactly 18,000 feet above the level or the censure of the ordinary inhabitants of this earth.

But with these facts before our eyes, and recollecting that the average number of volumes in ten of the largest



libraries of the world\* exceeds but by one half the volumes thus pushed into circulation, we cannot feel much surprise that this book should, like Aaron's rod, have swallowed up the whole literary activity of the last twelve months, and that the ordinary book trade of the country should have been almost altogether suspended. Nor should it be forgotten that much of the knowledge and information—forming the staple of the book trade in ordinary times—has been forced into new and unaccustomed channels by the necessity for its rapid dissemination within the limited period of the illustrations remaining accessible. In almost all of our leading political journals, the new facts of science and art, dressed up with all the attractiveness of news, were related in a form that admitted of easy modification in their statement, and discussion in their bearing. That this lull is but the prelude to animated gales, we feel confident. The past few months have been a period of patient suspense or critical examination. We have had the things themselves before us; a knowledge of their qualities must precede any theoretic analysis.

It is also a most important fact, which seems to have been little regarded, that the leading scientific minds of Europe have been hitherto in a measure bound to silence and secrecy, from being included in the lists of the juries. But let this seal be once removed—let the critical Reports of thirty sections, and at least one hundred and twenty sub-sections—giving the history of what has been, and is, and guesses at what ought to be and will be in every department of knowledge—and we have little doubt that a goodly array of commentaries, theories, systems in the old established form of full developed tomes,—besides all the lighter skirmishing of pamphlets,—will soon make their appearance. It is scarcely too much to predict that for every three lines in this Catalogue (the average length of a description) we shall soon see at least one or two works issue from the press, either questioning or discussing the merits there claimed, or the abstract principles involved in their statement. The wrongs, hardships, and injustice which have been hitherto tamely endured, by all whose contributions have been placed by the jurors in any other than the highest category of merit, will find a vent when these violations of all truth and reason become known.

That in the production of the present volume the contractors performed all their stipulated duties with the most praiseworthy

---

\* Number of Volumes in 'Bibliothèque du Roi,' at Paris, 650,000; Munich, 500,000; Copenhagen, 400,000; St. Petersburg, 400,000; Berlin, 320,000; Vienna, 300,000; British Museum, 270,000; Dresden, 250,000; Milan, 200,000; Göttingen, 200,000; Bodleian, 160,000; Trinity College, Dublin, 100,000.

exactitude can, we think, be hardly questioned; we would even go the length of admitting, that they have felt something of the dignity and importance of the occasion, and acted with spirit and liberality beyond perhaps what the pecuniary results justify; but we are not quite sure that the system of contract can be applied with any thing like safety, and except under the most rigidly controlling influences, to even this class of literature. This species of delegation has its advantages, and in the embarrassed state of the Exchequer of the Royal Commission at the period when the contract was entered into, such a step was no doubt both excusable and proper; but the extension of the system would have its dangers. Every step we advance in the secularisation of the clerical office opens an inlet to influences dangerous to the interests of science. There is a certain degree of sacerdotal sentiment needed in the bibliopolist function. In the case of America we see books treated as mere merchandise; and the consequence is, that, though she has sent us whole quires of her newspapers, her booksellers have not ventured to send a single sample of their mutilated manufacture.

Against the system of contract generally, or its universal application to the other departments of the enterprise, we have nothing to urge. 'It has ever been found,' says Edmund Burke, 'the best way to do all things which are great in the total amount, and minute in the component parts, by a general contract. By a general contract with a person in his own trade, you are sure you shall not suffer by want of skill.' With respect to the monopoly of provision for the wants of the body, as compared with that for those of the mind, it is, perhaps, curious to observe, that their sale should both have produced so nearly the same amount. The original sum of 3,200*l.* paid for the privilege to print the Catalogue added to the Royalty of two pence on each copy, would amount on 250,000 copies sold to 5,200*l.* The sale of the Refreshment monopoly produced 5,500*l.*

Passing for the present from the Catalogue to that of which it supplies the argument, it may be, perhaps, convenient if we here at once state the point of view from which it is our intention to treat the present subject. It may be conveniently divided into three distinct branches:—the project itself; the manner of its realisation; its immediate effects and its probable influences.

It is unnecessary for us to dwell at any length upon the objects or the views entertained by the illustrious personage with whom, by common consent, the present Exposition has in a great degree originated. These have been already suffi-

ciently explained in language to which no words of ours can lend additional grace or perspicuity. No great merit of originality attaches to the design; the only novelty consists in expanding an idea, often before partially realised, to a larger generalisation; the only praise in the unwavering fortitude with which, in the face of no ordinary difficulties, the original design was successfully worked out. And yet there is sometimes as complete a change produced by the simple addition of a few new sides to a project, as in the transition of the same carbon from the rhomboid of the dull graphite to the octohedron of the diamond,—from the brittle substance of the lead-pencil with which we trace the first dim outlines of our undeveloped conceptions to the adamant of the brilliant with which we beautify and elucidate light itself. To seize the living scroll of human progress, inscribed with every successive conquest of man's intellect, filled with each discovery in the constructive arts, embellished with each plastic grace of figured surface or of moulded form, and unroll this before the eyes of men, the whole stream of history furnishing its contingent,—placing Archimedes, Arkwright, Davy, Jacquard, Watt, and Stephenson side by side,—leaving the instructive lesson to be learned that always lies in the knowledge and example of great things done;—this is, indeed, no mean design, no infelicitous conception. It is only by such a cosmical comparison of the known agencies of science and art that we can gradually rise to a knowledge of the varied gifts and powers of Nature, or our own control over them: hereby alone can we hope with Faust,

‘ . . . to see the secret rings,  
Whose grasp the universe engirds;  
May know the force that works in things, —  
Not the mere sound that breathes in words.’

As a nation, we cannot claim the distinction of having originated this great lever of industrial progress; but we have at least given to the world the two philosophers, ‘Bacon’ and ‘Newton,’ who first lent direction and force to the stream of industrial science; we have been the first, also, to give the widest possible base to that watch-tower of international progress, which seeks the promotion of the physical well-being of man, and the extinction of the meaner jealousies of commerce.

Such exhibitions have for the last half century been growing into popularity, and may now be said to have assumed a place by the side of the congresses of diplomacy, the synods of the Church, and the manœuvres and sham fights of our armies. It is perhaps more remarkable that Europe should be indebted to France for the first suggestion of the idea, than that the first

essay of the inventors in 1797 — and the last in 1849 — should have been each totally or in part frustrated by the political turmoil of a revolution. In the other countries of Europe the census of domestic industrial power, and the census of population, have become formal government duties and an integral part of their administrative system, — prescribed with the same distinctness and carried out with the same regularity.

From the following extracts of a Circular \* issued by the present French Minister of Agriculture and Commerce, it will be seen that a plan somewhat similar to the present was broached by him previous to the last Paris Exposition in 1849.

‘ At a time (said M. Buffet) when my colleagues in office and myself are busily engaged in doing all we can to give the Exhibition, which opens on the 1st of June next, a character of public utility, it has occurred to me that it would be interesting to the country in general to be made acquainted with the degree of advancement towards perfection attained by our neighbours in those manufactures in which we so often come in competition in Foreign Markets.

‘ You will, therefore, first give your opinion on the abstract principle of exhibiting the productions of other countries; and, should you consider the experiment ought to be made, to enumerate to me officially the articles you consider would be most conducive to our interest when displayed in the ensuing Exhibition.’ The opinion given seems to have been unfavourable and the design abandoned.

In the history of our own extended scheme we recognise two distinct epochs; its early conduct in connexion with the Society of Arts, and its subsequent elaboration and completion under the powers of a Royal Commission; in both cases under the same president — the Prince Consort.

The early infancy of the scheme, whilst still under the fostering care of the Society of Arts, embraces the period from the year 1848, when it seems to have been first conceived, down to the 3rd of January, 1850, the date of the issue of the Royal Commission. The progress made in that interval was not inconsiderable, though many of the steps then taken were subsequently retraced. This portion of our narrative may be dismissed in a few words, and would perhaps hardly deserve even this passing notice, were it not that in one point — the character of the stimulant to competition — its influence is still felt. The Society had resolved on moving the world. It had, however,

---

\* Report on the Eleventh French Exposition by M. D. Wyatt. London: 1849.

something more needful to seek than the mere *ποῦ στᾶ*. It must find its lever. This world-compelling power it hoped to discover in the distribution of large pecuniary prizes, amounting in the aggregate to 20,000*l*.

For the attainment of its end it relied on the joint influence of money and enthusiasm. In obtaining the command of the former it seems to have been more fortunate than in awakening the latter. In a country like this any scheme of magnitude rarely fails of commanding the needful capital for its inception, though it not unfrequently languishes from subsequent apathy, or the jarring of conflicting interests or political jealousies. After casting about for some fitting instrument, the Society concluded a provisional agreement with an enterprising capitalist, who, in consideration of the right to two-thirds of the surplus profits, consented to advance the needful sum of 20,000*l*., and also to remove all pecuniary risk from the shoulders of the Society. It is impossible to deny that this willingness on the part of a private individual to undertake the risk, as well as his subsequent advances to meet the first expenses of the design, gave a consistence and commercial solidity to the project which well entitled him to the sum subsequently awarded on the cancelling of his agreement.

With the issue of the Royal Commission on the 3rd of January, 1850, the whole scheme assumed a totally different complexion. Few, if any, of the States of Europe would, we may hazard the prediction, have either contributed directly, or undertaken the expense and management of the transmission of the contributions of their subjects, had the organ of international communication been uninvested with the formal dignity of a State recognition. The control of the enterprise now passed, at least formally, into new hands, and a partial reorganisation of the governing body became necessary. It is a circumstance pregnant with significance far beyond any importance which may attach to the exposition of our industrial rivalries, that the list of Royal Commissioners actively engaged in the every day labour of the scheme, included the men of all parties, the heads of all factions, the Cæsars, Catos, and Ciceros of the State. We should perhaps be less inclined to appreciate the significancy of this circumstance, had we not been painfully impressed by the very dissimilar code of public action visible amongst our French neighbours. The recent cosmopolite fêtes at Paris were even less marked by the hospitality of the donors, or *brusquerie* of the military, than in the total void occasioned by the absence of every distinguished leader unattached to the dominant party. Neither at the Hôtel de Ville, nor at any of the banquets given

by the functionaries, was it possible to recognise the face or name of any other than a political partisan of the existing Government. Neither M. Thiers, nor M. Mole, nor M. Guizot, occupied a place at the board round which the amateur Mandarin Hésing and the Russian and American Commissioners sat. This circumstance becomes the more striking when we recollect that the presiding Minister of Commerce, M. Buffet, was the same who, on the occasion of the last French Exposition, had endeavoured, as before stated, but in vain, to induce his countrymen to assent to a widening of the basis of their Exposition, so as to admit of other than domestic competition.

The Royal Commissioners, whilst reserving to themselves the right of deciding on all points of principle arising out of the complicated questions constantly recurring, delegated to the Executive Committee, the task of working out the details and discharging all the active duties of the administration. In this distribution of functions, and the acquisition of such an executive body, on whom, after all, the due realisation of every scheme must mainly depend, there seems to have been an amount of good fortune and felicitous arrangement as unusual in the constitution of public bodies, as it is in keeping with the marvellous prosperity which has hitherto, beyond all precedent, waited on this undertaking.

We think we shall be strictly within the limits of historic truth, if we assert that at the date of their installation, 3rd of January, 1851, the prospects of the new-born corporation were far from dazzling. It is impossible to deny that there existed considerable zeal, and even much lively sympathy, in many quarters. Sixty different places had been visited by a deputation, dispatched by the President of the Society of Arts, some time previously. Local committees had been here and there formed, and 4200 influential persons had, as we are informed, enrolled themselves as promoters of the scheme. But, unhappily for the Royal Commission, the zeal of their supporters evinced itself pretty much in the same way as that of the Irish Poor-Law Guardians for the chief Board, in the propounding of the most enigmatical questions; and the sympathy of friends in tedious demonstrations of the futility, absurdity, and impracticability of the scheme. The design of the Royal Commission to organise local committees in every town, was not seconded by any great local enthusiasm. The chief difficulty, it would appear from the Report of the first person dispatched upon this mission, 'is to find anybody that will listen to you at all on the subject.' One of the first towns canvassed, Rochdale, refused its co-operation in consequence 'of the recent defalcations of the

'savings' bank of that town, and the consequent depression 'of spirits of the inhabitants.' From Cheltenham came grave doubts 'whether, as a fashionable watering place, it could be 'regarded as within the objects of the Royal Commission.' Hereford desires to be satisfied on abstract obligations, and, 'whether it is indispensably necessary that a town having a 'local committee should at least exhibit some one production.' Manchester would co-operate, provided satisfactory answers were returned to twenty-three different questions: 'Would 'the Royal Commission say how it intended to provide against 'two samples of the same or similar articles being sent in for 'exhibition? Where various towns have exactly the same kind 'of machines, is it intended to admit the same from different 'towns, or only one? if so, which? How many local committees are deemed desirable? 'What are the powers of the local 'commissioners? Are they to be delegate representatives of 'the local committees, or to have independent powers? Will 'local commissioners be allowed to be exhibitors?' Other towns had other scruples: 'Would a model of the docks and shipping 'of Liverpool be in accordance with the objects intended by 'the Exhibition. What is the total amount of subscriptions 'required in the judgment of the Commissioners? Is the subscription to be an absolute donation, or in the nature of a 'guarantee in case of deficiency? Will any expenses devolve 'upon local committees or local commissioners? if so, how are 'they to be met? Who was to pay for carriage? who for 'superintendence? who for insurance against fire, water, theft, 'and accident?'

It was not right nor reasonable to expect money, but anything else was at the service of the Commission. The local committees would, in short, aid them in the investigation of their theorems, assist them in the solution of their problems, would assent to all their axioms, but could not listen for a moment on the subject of postulates.

But if the prospect at home was cheerless and discouraging, there was surely little to excite hope or kindle enthusiasm in the aspect of affairs abroad. The same public journal that contained some moving homily addressed to the friends of brotherly unity on the blessings of peace, generally contained a no less exciting summons from half a dozen commanders to arms. The Commission invited the governments of the continent to mingle in idyllic brotherhood, at a time when both the governed and governors were engaged in a more rancorous contest from purely national motives than perhaps at any previous period. The very first dispatch of our Minister at Dresden, acknowledging

the receipt of the communications of the Commission, announced the fact 'of Prussia having refused to take any part in the then 'forthcoming Exhibition in Leipzig, as not desiring to have 'anything to do with a government, like the Saxon, which had 'treated her so badly.'

On the whole, the period of its first promulgation was one of general political convulsion, to which the annals of history happily offer but few parallels. From the Weser to the Danube, from the Belt to the Caspian, preparations for war were everywhere making. Denmark, Holstein, Germany, Prussia, Austria, Hungary, and Italy, bristled with armed men. The half extinct crater of Schleswig Holstein still sent up from time to time dense volumes of smoke. And hardly had the vivid glare of actual war passed away, when the flames burst suddenly forth from out the miniature volcano of deeply wronged Hessen-Cassel, scattering its burning embers throughout the length and breadth of the German Fatherland. Prussia had scarcely dismissed its soldiers, tired with the harassing duties of the internecine campaigns of Dresden and Rastadt, to their homes, when the voice of Radowitz, the soldier-orator, issued the hasty summons for all Prussians above the age of eighteen years, to fall into rank and prepare to renew the old hereditary struggles of the Houses of Hohenzollern and Hapsburg. Austria, still reeling beneath the weight of repeated shocks, seemed to have permanently taken to its tents; its capital and provincial cities appeared no longer safe; and, indeed, to this day are in a state of siege. France, after running through every stage of political excitement, and testing every form of government, from monarchy to republicanism, dictatorship, anarchy, Napoleonism, seemed scared and enfeebled to inaction. All the seats of European commerce had been transformed into camps of armed men. We had ourselves, indeed, escaped actual embroilment; but hopes of alliance blighted, or the marked discountenance of ungrateful theories, had not failed to produce strong sentiments of estrangement amongst even our oldest allies. Then came the painful incident with the Austrian Field-Marshal, as if to mock the hope of a peaceful meeting of such jarring elements, which had lived in fierce conflict for so long a time.

We have yet to allude to an event that deepened the general gloom of the period, and deprived the Royal Commission of one of its most strenuous and efficient supporters. From the minutes of the proceedings antecedent to the royal patent, we learn that 'His Royal Highness stated he had recently communicated his views regarding the formation of a great collection 'of works of industry and art in London in 1851, for the pur-



‘pose of exhibition and of competition and encouragement, to some of the leading statesmen, and, amongst them, to Sir Robert Peel. . . . His Royal Highness judged, as the result of these communications, that the importance of this subject was fully appreciated.’ The full import of these words was never thoroughly felt until the occurrence of that calamity which deprived the Royal Commission of the statesman, whose support abroad, even more than at home, was a tower of strength. It is not possible to over-estimate the value of the aid rendered, in liberal act and ready counsel, by the most worldly-wise of British statesmen to the labours of the Royal Commission. The minutes of the weekly meetings record hardly one at which the name of Sir Robert Peel is wanting — down to the very day of the fatal catastrophe on the 29th of June. He it was, we believe, who first suggested that the gold and silver medals, which had succeeded in supplanting the large money-prizes, should be abandoned, and bronze substituted. In the sitting of March 23. 1850, we find the following minute: ‘The draft of a statement to be issued to the public was proposed by Sir R. Peel, and approved.’ The introductory passage of this statement will be read, perhaps, with interest, as not uncharacteristic of the pen from which it flowed: — ‘Her Majesty’s Commissioners for promoting the Exhibition of 1851 have had under their consideration the subject of the prizes to be awarded to exhibitors, and have resolved to take immediate steps for having medals struck of various sizes and of different designs, it being their opinion that this is the form in which it will, generally speaking, be most desirable that the rewards should be distributed. They will endeavour to secure the assistance of the most eminent artists of all countries in producing these medals, which will, they hope, be valuable as works of art of the highest class, besides serving as records of distinction in connexion with the Exhibition. They have decided to select bronze for the material in which the medals are to be executed, considering that metal to be better calculated than any other for the developement of superior skill and ingenuity in the medallic art, and at the same time most likely to constitute a lasting memorial of the Exhibition.’ The foregoing is no bad example of the unrivalled skill of the writer in the use of the Optative mood—and the ability to fulfil the recent direction on a Florentine packing-case in Hyde Park, — ‘This case to be posed with softness.’ Such was the transition in the character of the prizes from large money rewards to simple bronze medals.

Having now indicated some of the moral difficulties with

which the designs of the Royal Commissioners had to contend at the very outset, we have next to direct attention to the nature of the machinery by which these and subsequent influences of a still more disheartening character were successfully combated, and eventually overcome.

Whilst the Royal Commissioners, under the presidency of Prince Albert, held their weekly meetings, in the Palace of Westminster, the Executive Committee, first under the presidency of Mr. Stephenson and subsequently of Lieut.-Colonel Reid, sat daily at their offices in Palace Yard; both bodies communicating through a third, the Finance Committee, under the presidency of Lord Granville. Several committees of sections, consisting of the leading men in the departments of agriculture, manufactures, and the arts, were forthwith nominated, whose function it was to facilitate the subdivision of their respective departments into proper classes, and to act generally as consultative bodies on all matters of a technical character within their respective spheres. If we add to the foregoing two Special Commissioners, Dr. Lyon Playfair and Lieut.-Col. Lloyd, who acted as intermediaries between the Royal Commission and the Local Committees, we take in at a glance the whole official organisation. Nothing can be more simple than the business routine of these several bodies; and nothing can better demonstrate the power of a sound organisation to dispose with accuracy and dispatch of an otherwise overwhelming amount of the most complicated business. The letters were in the first instance opened by the Executive Committee, their contents noted, and the answers at once written upon their faces; these answers were then copied, forwarded, and an entry of the substance of both the letter and the answer made in the letter-book. No formal archives were kept. It may, perhaps, give some idea of the amount of business thus dispatched to state that the number of letters so received and answered by the Executive Committee amounted, on the 15th of September, to 39,000. Letters involving questions beyond the competence of the Executive Committee were brought before the Royal Commissioners, and replied to by that body. In all matters involving an expenditure of money, a monthly estimate was prepared by a financial officer, whose calculations of receipts and disbursements were duly controlled by the Committee of Finance. The most rigid economy was enforced in every department. The slender prospects of the Commissioners' exchequer seem to have deterred the chairman and the majority of even the Executive Committee from accepting of any salary for their laborious exertions. It would almost seem as if the members of this body

had taken vows of poverty, which the sparing contributions of their supporters well enabled them to keep inviolate.

The sources of revenue from whence all expenses were defrayed consisted in the subscriptions of the local committees and of the affluent supporters of the scheme. These funds came in at all times tardily, but at the outset with especial meagreness. They amounted in the aggregate to 67,000*l.* including the royal donation of 1,000*l.* and that of the prince consort of 500*l.* In addition to their other cares, the constant demands on a failing exchequer, to meet the large and growing building and other charges, were a source of painful uneasiness up to the very opening of the Exhibition, and until the large subsequent receipts relieved all anxiety on this score. So inadequate were the early resources to meet the demands upon them that it was found necessary for certain members of the Commission to take the larger share of the pecuniary responsibility upon themselves, and form a guarantee fund to meet the exigencies of the scheme.

Having concluded this brief outline of the constitution of the governing body, we now come to the building itself: and first as to its site. The Royal Commission had, from the very outset, selected Hyde Park as the most fitting locality. Their choice lay between the place eventually decided on, and a locality not far distant, more to the north-east, which has since received all the suffrages of Mr. Babbage.\* It seemed decreed that their predilection for Hyde Park should encounter the same sinister fortunes as all their earlier aspirations. It is unnecessary to more than allude here to the hostility which the suggestions of the Royal Commission encountered. The topography of the metropolis was thoroughly explored; its capabilities, intra and extra-mural, rigidly weighed; numerous sites pointed out, which, if they did not fulfil any of the fancied requirements of the projectors of the scheme, at least compromised none of the great vested interests of good society. Battersea Fields, the Isle of Dogs, Victoria Park, Wormwood Scrubbs, and other devious localities, seemed less objectionable. The obstinacy of the Royal Commission and two divisions in Parliament eventually prevailed. The deluge of public animadversion began to subside; the windows of the firmament of Prince's Gate were closed: and on the 30th of August the peaceful messenger of the Royal Commission returned bearing the investitory branch from the Woods and Forests marking the Ararat of the Queen's

---

\* The Exposition of 1851: by Charles Babbage, Esq. London: 1851..

Drive as the resting place for the future Ark. The Building Committee called for designs. Two hundred and forty were sent in, with what results will appear from the following extracts of the minute dated 16th May, 1850:—

‘ We have the honour to report that we have examined the numerous plans so liberally contributed by native and foreign architects in accordance with the public invitation. . . .’

‘ We have, however, arrived at the unanimous conclusion, that able and admirable as many of them appeared to be, *there was yet no single one so accordant with the peculiar objects in view*, either in the principle or detail of its arrangement, as to warrant us in recommending it for adoption.

‘ In some of the least successful of the designs submitted, we find indicated errors and difficulties to be avoided, whilst in the abler and more practical of them, there are valuable conceptions and suggestions which have greatly assisted us in finding the plan we have now the honour to lay before you. . . .’

‘ The principal points of excellence we have endeavoured to attain are:—1. Economy of construction. 2. Facilities for the reception, classification, and display of goods. 3. Facilities for the circulation of visitors. 4. Arrangement for grand points of view. 5. Centralization of supervision. 6. Some striking feature to exemplify the present state of the science of construction in this country.’

This 6th requirement the plan so found sought thus to attain:

‘ In order that the building, in which England invites the whole world to display their richest productions, may afford, at least in one point, a grandeur not incommensurate with the occasion, we propose, by a dome of light sheet iron, 200 feet in diameter, to produce an effect at once striking and admirable.’

This plan, however, was, it would seem, as unanimously rejected by the public, as those of the public had been by the Committee. This must be regarded as decidedly the most critical juncture in the affairs of the Royal Commission. They had, already on the 17th of March, notified their intention of opening the Exhibition on the 1st of May, 1851, and on the 16th of July they had so far progressed, as to have arrived at the somewhat startling conclusion, that they had exhausted the constructive talent of Europe, and their own, and in vain.

It was in this dark hour when the fortunes of the Royal Commission seemed most desperate, that Mr. Paxton entered on the stage. In the midst of fruits and flowers, and the princely seclusion of Chatsworth, he had heard of battles, and he longed to follow to the field some warlike lord, and of such, in and out of the Building Committee, there was rumoured to be no lack.

It was not, he tells us, until the war of words was raging with great fierceness, that the thought occurred to him of making a design which would obviate all objections. He was just then constructing a palace for that most remarkable plant, the Victoria Regia. He came to London, stepped over the ground to ascertain its length and breadth; saw Mr. Cole of the Executive Committee; within nine days had his plans digested, and matured under the advice of Mr. Stephenson, and Mr. Barlow; had communicated with Fox & Henderson; found in Lord Brougham the warlike lord he sought, 'who from that time forth never uttered one word against the building, but became its warmest supporter.' Within a few weeks Mr. Paxton's plan was accepted, and in course of realisation. We have here given Mr. Paxton's own history of his design. Some doubts have been at various times raised respecting that gentleman's claim to be regarded as the inventor of the most characteristic features of the great structure. Mr. Paxton, the accomplished designer of the Crystal Palace, is perhaps himself not aware of the extent to which it might be possible by antiquarian research to trench upon his glories.

It has always been regarded as the immemorial duty of the critic when sitting in judgment on any work aiming at unusual novelty of conception, to examine with watchful eye the muniments of such claims; and the scrutiny has generally, some how or other, eventuated in their negation. The jealous muse of criticism has usually deemed it her first duty to remove whatever laurels may have been placed by other hands upon the hero's brow, as a preliminary to the award of that crown which it is her peculiar province to bestow. We have seen that 240 different designs had been contributed by various persons; eighteen of which, three English and fifteen foreign, were considered deserving of special honorary mention. Among these was one, that of M. Hector Horeau of Paris, of which the Building Committee made a still more special honorary mention. M. Hector Horeau had been a competitor for the construction of the recent Temple of Industry erected in the French capital. His design for the Hyde Park structure is thus described in the 'Builder' of the 15th of June, just *one month* before Mr. Paxton had announced his plan. 'M. Hector Horeau's design is for a building mainly of glass and iron,—a winter-garden in fact,—and displays much ingenuity. The iron-ribs of the roof are arranged so that, for the whole of the building, although of varying span, only three castings, it is said, will be necessary.' In this description, we find included almost all the features of the present Crystal Palace; so much so that it would be hardly

considered an imperfect description of the building as it actually stands. Let us add to this, that among the other contributors of designs, was one, Mr. Courtney, whose plan for the internal arrangement of the space would correspond pretty accurately with the existing distribution. In the Exhibition itself a model will be found of the building intended to be erected by Messrs. Turner of Dublin. This structure was also to have been exclusively of iron; and is honoured likewise with special mention, conjointly with that of M. H. Horeau, in the Report of the Committee. With respect to the latter it is noteworthy that the designer, like Mr. Paxton, had been conversant with the necessities of horticultural architecture, having built the great palm-house at Kew. We shall subsequently see what influence this 'floral style' is, in the opinion of one of the most distinguished foreign architects of the day, likely to exert on the mind of a designer.

It is far from our intention by the foregoing observations to deprive Mr. Paxton of the exclusive merit attaching to the originality and the wholeness of his most happy design. We only desire to indicate the dangers of antiquarian research, and with the more willingness, as the subjects of our commemoration seem to have hardly come in for their fair share of public acknowledgment. Happy ideas know no limitation of time or place, and are more likely to occur contemporaneously than apart. The discoveries in art and science have been especially simultaneous in modern times. The last-found planet—the Galvano-plastic art, and the Daguerreotype,—each discovered in distant countries at the same moment,—are each an instance of a simultaneity, that is at once a guarantee of our intellectual progress, and a consequence of the wide-spread activity of human thought. Mr. Paxton is undoubtedly, both by the entirety of his plan, and his numerous ingenious contrivances in detail, as completely the father of the Crystal Palace, as Caxton is the father of the English printing press, even though Gutenberg may have preceded him. He found the building of brick and mortar, and left it of glass and iron.

On the rejection of the plan of the Building Committee, and their adoption of the design of Mr. Paxton, certain modifications became necessary to meet the more than druidical reverence of modern Britons for the frondent shade of certain trees. Some of these had, indeed, leaped from their roots at the well-known voice of the Magician of Chatsworth. One, however, remained, and at every attempt to lacerate its boughs a voice issued—

. . . . gemitus lachrimabilis imo  
Auditur tumulto, —

from the gallant Polydorus of verdant Lincoln—a very arboreal *estatica*—realising the bleeding miracle of the poet of Mantua, and at least as genuine as those of Rimini. A fitting site had been now found for the great choragic ‘Lanthorn’ of Industry. The execution of the design was entrusted to Messrs. Fox and Henderson. These gentlemen belong to a race of modern ediles, such as Rome never saw, peculiar to this age, and in some measure to this country. These are the men of tubes and tunnels, true descendants of Jubal and Tubal Cain, excelling workers in brass and iron. They level hills, turn the course of streams, rear structures with a celerity and ease that shame the Pharaohs. Like the Roman ediles they are an essentially popular element, but have like them raised themselves to the Patrician order, occupy chairs of greater dignity and power than the *sella curulis* ever conferred; and include in their order one, whose achievements at the Menai Straits raise him to the rank of Pontifex Maximus,—the last step to which the Roman ediles, as we are informed by history, attained. The costliest among the golden and silver splendours of the world’s show, is the pictorial shield which displays the ‘jus imaginum,’ and recognises the merit, of one of this order—Mr. Brassey; and the tales of the munificence of this Giant of Causeways mock all belief. The gift of 10,000*l.* to relieve the distresses of a partner’s widow is one among these legendary narratives, but with more of truth, we believe, than generally characterises a legend. On the marvels wrought by the constructors of the Crystal Palace it is needless to descant. In seven short months they reared an edifice, which by the common consent of all men and nations is of a more thaumaturgical character than any of the varied wonders it includes. There is something so simple and characteristic in the following statement of the fashion in which these men do extraordinary things, that we must make room for the description, given in our hearing by Mr. Fox, of the mode in which he sought to realise the nature of his task to his own mind. ‘When our tender was accepted,’ said the speaker, ‘I walked out in the evening and paced the length of Portland Place. I found this street corresponded exactly with the site in Hyde Park; the houses on either side were nearly the intended height of the sides of the building; the street was about one fourth of the width; I then felt that it would indeed be a *big* place. Feeling that the same man should draw the plans and execute them, I made all the working drawings with my own hand, and watched over their execution to the last.’ We need not here advert to the difficulties interposed by the apprehensions of well-meaning advisers,—the shortness

of the time allowed, the unusual wetness of the season, or the combinations of the workmen. An army of nearly two thousand men were constantly employed in rearing this fabric, and to the power of discipline and organisation to which they were subjected is it alone attributable that the work was done, well done, and done within the stipulated time. Those who desire a more intimate acquaintance with the extraordinary resources which were here brought to bear, may be referred to the accounts given in the many professional works which have appeared on the subject. It might amuse but it could have no real utility to recapitulate the various objections from time to time suggested during the progress of the works, to the scientific principles adopted, and supposed to be violated in its construction. It is more satisfactory to reflect that dynamic principles in themselves novel, and opposed to received doctrines of metallic vibration, tension, elasticity, expansion, have been now fully established, beyond all cavil, and by the severest of tests. It is due to Mr. Cubitt, the Chairman of the Building Committee, to state, that he assumed much of the responsibility and shares the merit of these results. Before dismissing this subject we must make room for an anecdote which may not be altogether out of place, as happily defining the difference between the power of realising a conception of abstract beauty, and the working out of a great practical design. Professor Kiss, of Berlin, the author of the much admired Amazon group was so struck with the mechanical wonders of the building, that he sought an opportunity to express to the constructor, through the medium of an interpreter, his sense of astonishment and admiration of his extraordinary achievements. When the artist had given vent to the fulness of his feelings in the genuine outpourings of a German artist's heart; 'Tell him,' was Mr. Fox's epigrammatic reply, 'I can *make* this'—pointing to the building—'but I could not *do* that'—pointing to the group. In this *make* and *do* lies just the difference between constructive talent and creative genius—manufacture and art.

The following extract relates to this branch of our subject. The original Paper emanated, we have reason to believe, from the pen of a writer, himself the architect of one of the most admired of modern edifices—the late Dresden Opera-house; and its remarks on the structural peculiarities of the building are of a character sufficiently interesting to excuse our translation and insertion of them here. The unhappy political convulsions of the year 1849 proved equally fatal to the high professional position of its author, and the graceful monument of his genius. The Paper was written on the eve, and amidst all the bustle and preparation of the opening:—



‘ When the busy din around us threatens to overwhelm our senses, how gladly do we seek composure by allowing our eyes to rest on those trees, which the building still encircles with its net-work, and the axe has spared! How charming! as stimulated by the busy scene around them, they seem hastening to strip off the last cinctures that confine their blossoms, and with their fan-like forms fill out the lofty canopy of the transept, blending their verdant foliage with the bars of its airy lattice-work. What a contrast between the noisy scene below, and the majestic silence with which nature completes her works. The whole picture breathes all the youthful yet antique life and freshness of a Pompeian fresco. It does honour to the architect who has so successfully brought his work into such entire unison with nature; and, considering the character and conditions of the problem to be solved, it is hardly possible to conceive a different, not to say a better, solution—the best criterion of a happy conception. Perhaps none other than a horticultural artist could have succeeded in devising so fitting a cradle for a project whilst yet in embryo. The first suggestions of fancy are ever shapeless and gigantic; they shrink into form, and condense as they become matured, in this inverting the laws of organic development.

‘ The simple problem was to portion off such a space from the open air, as should include a world of bazaars, and protect them from the influences of the weather; all else was vague and undecided. As yet no statistics existed to determine the relative exhibiting requirements of the several States. The building must, therefore, possess a certain degree of elastic expansibility; and consequently no limiting configuration, such as that of the circle or the square, was admissible. Instead of any compact relation among the interior members, it must offer capabilities of easy partition and be fashioned in the spirit of a huge encampment.

‘ For the fulfilment of such a task, the artist, who had already provided for the similar requirements of his exotic plants, possessed some facilities. Structures of the latter class identify themselves in a measure with living nature; their walls and roofs invisible to the eye, and the more slender and impalpable their parts, the more suited to their purpose.

‘ Little was needed to render this class of structure adapted to the present purpose. Here, too, no architectural embellishment must compromise the internal requirements, and consequently all conventional rules and decorations must be laid aside. Much light is needed, but sunshine injurious; a *velum* must, therefore, shroud the glassy *hypæthros*; or rather, it was necessary, in an

‘artistic point of view, that the latter should fall with a graceful swell within the roof; and had the glass been stronger this would have been feasible. In that case the slender columns would have become the bearers of the primitive *velum*, which would have completely harmonised with the suspended draperies and figured carpets, that hang perpendicularly between the columns and fill up the intercolumnar spaces; and thus, in our age of most complex knowledge, we should have seen in this marvellous building the original type of the most primitive form of architecture unwittingly realised. Out of the canvass stretched on poles, the Egyptian flat roof grew; and the original perpendicular partition, the suspended carpet, is the prototype of all the rich panellings, paintings, or other plastic decorations, in wood, stone, or metal, which in after times supplied the place of the original woven fabrics. The numerous trophies and ornaments suspended from the columns and girders, point to the original motives in the decoration of all columns and beams. The *velum* now wanting might be in future supplied by stained glass, and in the ornamentation of the draperies, machinery can be brought to bear with less detriment to refined taste, than has been unhappily the case in other branches of the decorative art. Who does not feel that iron arabesques and ornaments produce a feeling of disgust? and is it not perhaps a sign of a revival of better taste, that architecture ventures to exhibit the simple effects produceable by those materials, the ornamentation of which is susceptible of extension by mechanical means, and thus leaves the field open to future improvement? This primitive simplicity of the work seems to constitute its architectural importance. On the other hand, a complete revolution must take place in English manners before the glass roof can find adoption in private dwellings or religious edifices. It would lead to the introduction of courts and the Italian Palazzo style, as has long since taken place in Russia.

‘In conclusion, a word as to the transept, which now merely serves as a covering for trees; and the necessity for which is not sufficiently obvious from any reference to the internal economy of the building. Here must be the seat of the Areopagus that awards the prizes, the only stable point in the midst of a building elsewhere subject to indefinite expansion. As to the exterior it is needless, for the reasons already assigned, to make much comment. To buildings of this character it has hitherto been found impossible to give such a configuration as can be taken in at a glance, and therefore satisfy the requirements of a strictly æsthetic feeling.’

On the subject of internal decoration all opinions seem favour-

able to the system of colouring adopted. Though naturally propitiated by the prevailing 'buff and blue,' we cannot assent to the axiom of Mr. Owen Jones: that these colours should always be wedded with the 'crimson'—our own hopes and tastes are adverse to such a necessity as a law. But we gladly summon up this native hue of modesty in the artist's cheek, by comparing the results achieved under his supervision, with those of a rival. Speaking of the late building in Paris, the valuable Report to which we have already referred, remarks:—

'Both externally and internally, there is a good deal of tasteless and unprofitable ornament; all the pilasters are papered and painted in a species of graining to imitate light oak, and even the ceiling is covered over with the same work. Large carton pierre trusses apparently support the timbers, and a painted bronze bas-relief fills the tympanum of the pediment at the principal entrance. The architecture of the whole is meagre, although the gigantic scale of the building necessarily elevates the general effect into something of impressiveness; not however to the extent which the same outlay might have produced.'

The concluding remark of the foregoing extract induced us to make some calculations on the relative cost of the two buildings, which we have here ventured to compare; and the result is in so far very satisfactory, as it establishes the advantage in point of economy of our own building over its Parisian rival. The French structure covered a space of about five acres, or just one fourth of that in Hyde Park. The sum paid for the temporary or three months' use of the materials—timber, with a roof of zinc, was about 18,500*l*. So that the cost per square foot amounted to 1*s*. 3*d*. As the superficial area, including the galleries, of the Hyde Park building may be assumed at about twenty-five acres, and the sum agreed to be paid for a year's use of the materials is 78,000*l*., or about 1*s*. per foot, there is an obvious saving in favour of Mr. Paxton's design.

We must now return to the Royal Commission, who have by this time taken up their abode in the building itself, awaiting its completion. The task of organisation had been pushed forward successfully throughout the country. Local committees had exhausted their stock of queries—most of which had through the lapse of time answered themselves. Manchester redeemed its character by liberal contributions. The banquet of Mayors had gone off with éolat. Influential exhibitors in forty towns had, on the suggestion of Sir Robert Peel, been induced to apply for space, whose example acted pretty much like the mirrors, which our transatlantic neighbours insert in their newly

invented rat-traps in order to stimulate by the terrors of competition the avidity of the candidates for the caseous bait. Many of the public Journals gave in their adhesion. The *Morning Chronicle*, gifted with a keener foresight than many of its contemporaries, on the dawning success of a cause, of which it had through good and evil report been an unwavering supporter, striking into a new path, opened its columns to such foreign contributions, both French and German, as the interesting one of the Dresden architect, an extract from which we have presented to our readers in an English garb. Applications for space, vertical, horizontal, and lateral, began to pour in from home and distant committees. Professor Johnson, 'on the part of some of the States near the Rocky Mountains, craved a little time for the transmission of their goods.' The sale of the Catalogue-right and refreshment monopoly produced larger amounts than had been anticipated. On the whole, the prospects of the Commission had become considerably brighter. Two questions, however, remained unsolved,—the publication of the prices, and the terms of admission for the public and exhibitors.

The first of these questions has been discussed at considerable length by Mr. Babbage in the work to which we have already alluded. On the abstract principle of its being desirable to know the cost and every other particular respecting the articles exhibited, there has never, as far as we are aware, existed any difference of opinion. The difficulty seems to have been the attaining a correct knowledge of the prices; and the obstacles have been two-fold, — the unwillingness of the retail-trader to have the prime-cost made known, and the unwillingness of many manufacturers to state the real price of their fabrics. In an undertaking of an altogether voluntary character, a compulsory disclosure of any information studiously withheld is not feasible. There are also, as regards the present Exhibition, two elements of price of which Mr. Babbage seems to take no note—custom-duties and agio. We, for our part, should have been glad to have seen the tariff of each country suspended in each department, and the protective duty which it enjoys marked on each article. To complete the idea of price as regards the casual visitor, it would have been necessary to state the duty at which it is admissible into the country to which the importer belongs. It would be necessary to state, in addition, the transport expenses, and the quantities and the time in which the article could be delivered. For an intending purchaser these calculations are a matter of course—but still not made without considerable difficulty. In many of the cases which have come under our own immediate notice, with every desire on the part of the seller to obtain a

purchaser, it proved impossible to give the information desired. Let us take an example. The price of the American reaping-machine of Mr. Mac Cormick, which has attracted so large a share of attention, is stated to be 28*l*. If a German desire to purchase one of these implements, he is informed, that he must wait until a patent has been obtained in the State to which he belongs, and the required machine constructed there, as the customs duty on a single machine would be nearly 10*l*. in the Zollverein. The cost of carriage of such a cumbrous implement from the United States precludes the possibility of its being supplied from thence. The price is, for the present therefore, wholly unascertainable. Let us take another example. Suppose an English purchaser desirous of buying some of the remarkably cheap cloths exhibited from Brünn in Moravia, the low price of which is said to have tempted one of the jurors of this class to abandon the office of inquisitor in Hyde Park for a more practical test in Brünn itself. We will suppose him to have made a purchase to the value of 1200 guildens. These 1200 guildens, if paid in English gold, are at present equal to about 1000 guildens, or in the ratio of about 12 to 10, such being the present rate of exchange, but so fluctuating, that within three months it may easily rise or fall 10 or even 20 per cent. Practically speaking, we do not think that it would have been possible to add much more to our knowledge of prices than is conveyed in our own priced lists, and the priced catalogues which several of the foreign countries, such as Belgium, Spain, Russia, Austria Turkey and the States of the Zollverein have published. In many articles, chemicals for instance, the price is quite illusory, as it would be found that but very small quantities could be obtained at anything like a useful commercial price.

The general question of admission of exhibitors and visitors, which at one time threatened to assume an alarming aspect, found a solution which must be considered as reconciling the interests of all concerned. Exhibitors, both home and foreign, were admitted gratuitously, and the graduated scale of entrance fees charged to the public seems to have met with general approbation. The issue of season tickets was a happy idea, conducive to the comfort of the holders and the revenue of the Commission's exchequer.

We have now disposed of the most important preliminary questions which so long agitated the public mind. There were still many who, like the worthy parishioners of Marylebone, viewed the rising structure with the feelings with which the inhabitants of the Scæan Gates of Ilium may be supposed to have regarded the great Trojan horse, which was to bring a

foreign foe within their walls. But the contractors plied their hammers,—

Instar montis equum divinâ Paxtonis arte  
Edificant;

Many of the foreign commissioners, of the foreign goods, and foreign workmen had arrived. Now began the duty of assigning to each country its proper limits. We believe the suggestion of a geographical distribution according to the terrestrial relations of each State originated with the Chairman of the Executive Committee. This happy idea of assuming the transept as the equator, and proceeding according to Mercator's projection solved many difficulties. But still it is little known how the political feelings and passions of the great world were mirrored in this microcosm. The intrigues and *tracaseries* of diplomacy were as actively displayed on the miniature chart of the Executive Committee as in the cabinets of kings. The cave of Æolus itself could have hardly afforded the gallant Chairman greater facilities for testing his 'Theory of Storms' than his own narrow chamber. To this day the question of Schleswig-Holstein remains undecided, after having given rise to the most stormy and animated protocols. The official recognition of Algiers as an integral part, not more adjunct, of France by Captain Owen, was demanded with a degree of insistence that might have startled Pinnock or my Lord Palmerston. Whether Holland be styled Holland or the Netherlands; whether Turkey be Turkey, and Egypt be called Egypt, may seem a matter of no great difficulty. Whether the proper style be Norway and Sweden or Sweden and Norway may appear of little moment. But all these are questions which occupied much of the time of the distributors of the territorial limits. The partition of Poland itself has hardly provoked more discussion than the struggles of Prussia and Austria to absorb the small kingdom of Saxony. Spain actually refused to exhibit unless provided with an entrance distinct from that of Portugal; and the transposition of the Imperial furniture court of Austria from a southern to a more northern latitude seemed pregnant with consequences as grave as those attending the transfer of the Court of the Emperors from Rome to Byzantium, and actually led to a blockade of the Austrian consignments for a week in the port of Hamburg. Every change in the political horizon made itself distinctly felt here, just as the curious Chinese mirrors reflect on their surface the grotesque images at their back.

Under the conjoint influences of time, the firm suavity of the Executive Committee, and perhaps the sense of a common

danger from the slight leakage of the roof, the heat of these topical animosities gradually subsided. In the English divisions all proceeded smoothly. The admirable classification, according to the minute and exhaustive system of Dr. Lyon Playfair, well adapted as the basis of the future Census and Custom-house returns, worked with the most satisfactory speed and tranquillity. One class of objects alone proved an exception. Wigs—once so venerated—sued now in vain for a place for fitting display. There were four several categories, under any one of which, consistently with a strictly scientific distribution they might be classed. 1. Raw products; class IV. animal substances used for personal adornment; wool, hair, bristles: 2. Manufactures, class III. articles of clothing, as hats, caps, bonnets; 3. skins, furs, feathers, and hair. It seems, however, that none of the superintendents of these several classes would admit their claims as paramount. The result was, that whilst some were to be found in class 16. leather, including harness and their antipodes boots and shoes, others eventually settled down into class 2. chemicals, and dyes. It is further worthy of remark, as indicative of some strange, perhaps hereditary, inquietude of this class of articles, that we find their single exhibitor in the Russian department, a French hair-dresser at Odessa, actually petitioning the Russian Commission to induce Her Majesty to postpone the solemn opening on the 1st of May for the space of three days, to enable him to get his six interesting wig-blocks in becoming order for the occasion.

We must not omit alluding to one happy result of those political convulsions on the Continent of which we have already spoken. Pending the internal arrangements and subsequent display, the demand for persons acquainted with foreign languages was, as may be supposed, unusually great. This want was in a great measure supplied by the large number of political refugees, whom the late convulsions had domiciled in this country. It is at once a curious and instructive fact, that the vast majority of those who formed the immediate *entourage* of the royal personages visiting the Exhibition, consisted of men who, having been condemned for democratic opinions in their respective countries to imprisonment for life, or even to death, had eluded the vengeance of the laws and the vigilance of the police. Indeed, it seems improbable, had it not been for this singular source of supply, that the labours of the Foreign Commissioners would have been completed so early, or at all, except at an enormously increased pecuniary sacrifice. In no case, however, have we heard of any evil consequences arising from this source, and in but one of the subsequent dismissal of

an official, on merely political grounds. We may here further state that of the twenty foreign interpreters, whom the Commissioners of Police, from obvious considerations, deemed it prudent to appoint previous to the 1st of May, sixteen were dismissed within a very short period, their services being altogether unneeded, as hardly a single case occurred calling for their intervention, notwithstanding the vast concourse of foreigners, who crowded to our shores.

In all their relations with the several Foreign Commissioners, the Executive Committee seem to have acted on the same sound principle as in their intercourse with the local committees at home; leaving the widest possible latitude of action to each, and refusing in all cases the responsibility of interference in details, when not compromising the fundamental principles of the general design. The prudence of this course will be fully appreciated when it is recollected that some of the members of the Foreign Commissions were, from long habit, prone to an ostentatious display of power in their respective spheres. Often irritated from an incapacity to explain or receive explanations, ignorant of our language and habits, — sometimes under the influence of strong prejudices — occasionally mortified by the absence of those marks of courtly distinction, which form the cherished objects of their ambition; they were occasionally not indisposed to escape the responsibilities of a task in itself arduous, by throwing upon the measures and conduct of the Royal Commission and Executive Committee, the responsibility of a failure, which seemed the more probable from the sinister accounts that had reached them before their arrival. We are inclined to think that had these several bodies been better linguists, they might have proved less efficient commissioners, and have wasted in sterile controversy the time needed for action. A marked feature of this period was the number of questions constantly arising on abstract principles; whether, for instance, in the composition of the juries, the most eminent representatives of different branches of manufactures should be assigned to their own or to other branches. It was warmly contended that by making the successful adopters of varying systems judges of forms of procedure differing from those pursued by themselves, you incurred the risk, some maintained the certainty, of their never agreeing to any joint award; so that to insure a practical result you must take a less interested, though worse-informed body. On this and similarly vexed points, Free Conferences were held, but with little result. Two great State federations had already formed. France, Russia, Austria, Saxony, on one side; Prussia,



Bavaria, Switzerland on the other; each with their respective adherents. On one occasion the weaker party resolved on a deputation to Lord Granville, whose affability and fertility of resources secured each suitor at least the semblance of success. The Noble Lord, in this instance, is believed to have yielded *sive dolo, seu*,—rather to the numbers than the arguments of the petitioning body. It subsequently appeared, however, that this embarrassing unanimity arose from a feeling on the part of the dissentients, that the dignity of their several States, irrespective of the opinions they represented, required their presence on all such occasions.

As we have mentioned the subject of the juries, it may be as well to offer a few remarks on their constitution and on their peculiar function—the recognition of merit. A glance at the long array of distinguished names comprised in the list of jurors, both home and foreign, is sufficient to satisfy us of the fact, that the ablest judges in each department of knowledge occupy seats in the great Areopagus of science. Of the ability of the judges there can be little doubt; for their impartiality their mixed constitution affords a powerful guarantee. Individual instances of equivocal qualification, and even of the playful irony of chance may, and, we believe, have occurred. Accident or malice has given circulation to the mistake of a member of the jury on ‘Chemical and ‘Pharmaceutical Processes and Products,’ who admired the huge rock-crystal of the Duke of Devonshire as an interesting specimen of Alum. In another instance, we have discovered more direct evidence of fallibility still more amusing. Among the Chairmen of Group D,—Metallic, Vitreous, and Ceramic manufactures—we find the name of the Hon. Horace Greeley, whose aristocratic appellation has more of the perfume of Belgravia than Hoboken. In a communication headed ‘Editorial Correspondence, London, ‘May 15th,’ we find the following passage, which, coming from one of the Chairmen of Group D, contains views on a subject upon which all Englishmen feel peculiarly sensitive—architectural decoration—so novel and soothing to our British pride, that we must regret their partial acceptance.

‘The *Buildings* here, says the honourable writer, are generally superior to those of our city of New York—more substantial, of better materials, and more tasteful. There are, I think, as miserable rookeries here as anywhere; but they are exceptions, while most of the houses are built solidly, faithfully, and with a thickness of walls which would be considered sheer waste, in our city. Among the materials most extensively used is a fine white marble of a peculiarly soft, creamy appearance, which looks admirably until blackened by smoke,

‘and time. Regent Street, and several of the aristocratic quarters west of it, are in good part built of this marble; but one of the finest, freshest specimens of it is St. George’s Hospital, Piccadilly, which, to my eye, is among the most tasteful edifices in London. If (as I apprehend) St. Paul’s Church, Somerset House, and the similarly smoke-stained dwellings around Finsbury Oval, were built of this same marble, then the murky skies of London have much to answer for.’

Whilst revelling in the anticipation of the effect of such statements as the foregoing, our feelings were doomed to experience a rude shock. A communication in the same journal some days later, from an envious New York citizen, stated, on the authority of a ten years’ residence in London, that the ‘fine white marble, with the soft creamy appearance,’ of the Hon. Chairman, was, in reality, but *mud painted*. We have looked for the editorial rejoinder, but we regret to say, in vain. Such isolated instances of human fallibility, though they teach the great lesson of humility, can never shake our faith in the old Gothic axiom of our ancestors: ‘to whomsoever God giveth an office, to the same doth He give the necessary measure of wisdom;’ and we shall look with the same reverence on the Institutes, Pandects, and Novels of Physical Law, when once promulgated by the Council of Chairmen in the collective Reports of the Jurors, as we have been long habituated to regard the digested labours of the old Byzantine Jurists embodied in the Justinian code. It is also right to bear in mind, that from the frequency of Industrial Exhibitions in recent times, there is a regular class of practised Judges rapidly forming,—men who derive as much advantage from this practical acquaintance with the subjects of their theoretic studies, as they confer benefit on industrial science, by the loftiness of their views and the wide range of knowledge which they bring to bear on the problems of commercial life. We cannot help regarding this circumstance as of the highest importance, since it has the twofold effect of enabling them to readily distinguish what is really new, and rapidly circulate a knowledge of all that is valuable in such discoveries.

We have now reached the 1st of May. On that day the Royal Commission redeemed their pledge, and reaped the well-deserved reward of all their cares and anxieties. We must leave it to the memory or the imagination to paint the splendours of a pageant more brilliant than any spectacle of modern times. The effect of the dazzling scene was rather heightened than diminished by the mystery that still hung round several of the Foreign departments. America had unfolded her homely

stores — so rude and practical that no aid of decoration could or need impart much external attraction. And here let us do an act of justice by stating, that the apparently disproportionate space occupied by the United States, which has been the subject of so much railleury, had been spontaneously assigned, not demanded. France was much in arrear; but France has never known the art of colonisation. One of her Commissioners remarked on the day of the inauguration: 'You, English-people, have succeeded because you are without experience; you do what is necessary — we, what we have done before.' Much painful anxiety had been felt by Lieut. Colonel Reid, as Commander-in-chief of the allied forces, from the tardy movements of the Zollverein, but M. Consul-General Hebelér and his Prussians succeeded, like Blücher, in arriving in time. Russia had not yet opened her rich malachite portals to the public gaze; nor had the Odessa contributor quite succeeded to his own satisfaction in developing his capillary attractions; but even the empty pedestals gave promise, and the rich velvet draperies of the Imperial Chamber spoke of the splendours to come. Hamburg and Switzerland exhibited the punctuality and business-habits of their commercial populations, equally with our own exhibitors; and the other Foreign States were in very tolerable order.

Every road leads to Rome: — but we must not dwell on the crowds nor the wonders that attract them. The commercial value of the latter is less than the fears of our London shopkeepers represented them. You could buy all Prussia for about 45,000*l.*; Saxony for 30,000*l.*; the whole Zollverein for 100,000*l.*; and America and Russia for about 36,000*l.* each! Leaving to some future Hesiod to chronicle the *Ἡμέραι καὶ Ἔργα*, we shall introduce a few statistical tables illustrative of the most striking peculiarities of the undertaking.

The most singular feature in the internal economy of the Hyde Park structure is the number of its different Departments, and the magnitude to which each has swelled. Within its walls we have had a constant population equal to that of a populous city. It has its post-office — its branch bank — its telegraph — its miniature railroad — its little army — its police. Its cafés and table d'hôtes provide for the wants of its local and wayfaring inhabitants. It has made other adequate arrangements for decency and health, of which the great neighbouring metropolis is so glaringly neglectful. The following Table shows the numbers and occupations of the ordinary local population: —

Correspondence - - -	7	Brought over - - -	107
Post-Office - - -	2	<i>Interior Staff.</i>	
Finance - - -	9	Superintendents, Clerks, &c. - - -	80
<i>The Admittance Department.</i>		Classmen - - -	89
Superintendent - - -	1	Porters - - -	7
Assistant Do. - - -	1	Sweepers - - -	36
Clerk - - -	1	Messengers - - -	2
Season Ticket takers - -	6	Refreshment and Retiring Rooms - - -	28
Money takers - - -	18	Fire Department - - -	7
Door-keepers - - -	21	Sappers - - -	200
Juries - - -	9	Police - - -	400
Messengers, Office-keepers, and Boys - - -	23	Customs - - -	12
Variouly employed - - -	9	3 Refreshment Rooms - -	264
Carry over - - -	107	Total - - -	1182

The above table exhibits the comparatively small amount of the force employed in the attainment of results, the magnitude of which incurs no risk of not being duly appreciated by the five million of visitors.

We have no room for various statistical tables illustrative of the many curious results which the concentration of seductions so powerful as those of the Crystal Palace produce on our social economy. They are in several respects both novel and interesting. One of the most responsible and difficult duties of the Executive Committee was the effort to evolve from pre-existent sources, some approximate estimate, whereby to guard, as far as human foresight could, against dangerous contingencies. The industry of one of this Executive Committee, Mr. Wentworth Dilke, succeeded in obtaining a vast collection of statistical details as to the numbers, conduct, and habits, of the visitors to the most frequented of our public sights. We are indebted to the painstaking researches of this gentleman for the following figures, which we throw into a tabular form to facilitate comparison.

Greatest number of Visitors on any one day at following places: —

Greenwich Fair (Easter-Monday) - -	150,000
Greenwich Railway (Easter-Monday) - -	23,889
Vauxhall, Admission One Shilling, largest number	21,000
British Museum (Easter-Monday) - -	21,005
Exhibition of Cartoons, Westminster Hall - -	34,782
Exhibition of Oil Painting, Westminster Hall - -	29,572
Covent Garden Bazaar, highest number - -	11,000
Ten of largest Theatres, about - -	30,000

It will be observed that none of the above can be regarded as quite analogous to the Hyde Park Exhibition. As an instance of the importance which matters apparently trivial attained on this occasion, it will be observed, that the daily receipts from the custody of umbrellas, walking-sticks, and wearing apparel, although conducted on the voluntary system, amounted frequently to 25*l.*, although the charge was as low as two-pence.

The following Table shows the actual receipts to the 25th of Sept. inclusive:—

			£	s.	d.
Subscriptions	-	-	67,205	8	10
Season tickets	-	-	67,610	14	0
Receipts at the doors	-	-	304,018	12	6
Catalogue contract	-	-	3,200	0	0
Refreshment contract	-	-	5,500	0	0
Retiring rooms	-	-	2,104	5	10
Washing places	-	-	396	2	2
Taking charge of umbrellas	-	-	573	17	6
Medals struck in the building	-	-	658	15	10
Weather charts sold in building	-	-	5	5	8
			451,273	2	4

The highest amount received at the doors was on Saturday, the 24th May, the last five shilling day prior to the commencement of the shilling days, being 5078*l.* The lowest amount received on any day, except the two 1*l.* days, was on the first shilling day, being only 920*l.*

The largest amount received in shillings was 3502*l.*, on Tuesday, 15th July (St. Swithin's Day). On the Friday of the same week 3762*l.* was taken in half-crowns, being the highest amount after the commencement of the shilling days.

The following are the highest amounts received:—

	£	s.	d.		£	s.	d.
Saturday, May 24	-	5078		Tuesday, August 5	-	3236	1 0
Friday, " 23	-	4095		Monday, July 28	-	3194	1 0 Eclipse.
Thursday, " 22	-	3797		Tuesday, June 17	-	3191	1 0
Friday, July 18	-	3762	2 6	Tuesday, " 24	-	3186	1 0
Wednesday, May 21	-	3512	5 0	Tuesday, July 8	-	3169	1 0
Tuesday, July 15	-	3502	1 0	Friday, " 11	-	3145	2 6
Tuesday, May 20	-	3360	1 0	Thursday, " 17	-	3023	1 0
Wednesday, " 21	-	3338	1 0	Monday, June 23	-	3016	1 0
Thursday, " 29	-	3308	1 0	Monday, August 4	-	3006	1 0
Tuesday, July 22	-	3236	1 0				

The amounts received each day at the retiring rooms vary from 3*l.*, 7*l.*, and 8*l.*, to 28*l.* Receipts for taking charge of umbrellas, &c., from 9*s.* to 25*l.*

In the absence of reliable data to guide their conduct, the

Committee seem to have adopted the principle of leaving the public at large, in a great measure, to consult for their own safety; and the result has fully justified the propriety of this course. The number of daily visitors has been subject to far less violent fluctuation than could have been expected; and the daily returns appear to indicate, as a law, that the maximum power of any Exhibition with us to attract shilling visitors must be somewhat about 50,000 daily. But, perhaps, the most remarkable, as it is the most satisfactory feature in connexion with these large bodies of people, is the fact that on no occasion was the slightest tendency to disorder perceptible, and that not one single instance of wilful damage to any of the articles exhibited has been reported to the Committee.

Incidental to this great occasion, it is very satisfactory to reflect, that owing to the adoption of a happy suggestion of the Prussian Minister, Chevalier Bunsen, very simple and adequate arrangements were made to enable the subjects of Foreign States to examine our great national monuments and public establishments without confusion or difficulty. Each Embassy issued cards, on which the leading objects of attraction were marked upon a miniature chart, together with the rules to be observed in visiting them. It is also well deserving of the highest praise, that foreigners were admitted to view our great private industrial establishments with a degree of liberality and courtesy that has much elevated our national character in the eyes of the world. We have, in a measure, to thank this Exposition for our being no longer regarded as a nation of *boutiquiers*.

The conduct of the Police has been the subject of well-merited encomium. We have heard a distinguished Foreigner declare, that the civility and intelligence of our police, and the number of our water-omnibusses (river-steamboats) were the objects that most excited his surprise. A plan had been discussed by the Foreign Commissioners of opening a penny subscription among their countrymen to mark the universal sense of all foreigners of the exemplary conduct of our constables; nothing but the formal difficulties prevented, as we believe, the realization of this idea.

The primary characteristic of this great enterprise has been the comprehensiveness of the scheme and the world-embracing character of its appeal to the industrial energy of nations. We have been compelled to allude to the melancholy political complications which, occurring at a juncture so critical, had nearly compromised its realisation; but, it would be wrong to omit observing, that it found everywhere throughout the civilised world a degree of favour, on its very first promulgation, and

met with a degree of support from Rulers and their subjects that argued well for the intelligence of the age and the inherent soundness of the plan itself. The dictates of civilisation are everywhere alike. 'Different degrees of refinement and not of distance, mark the distinctions among mankind. Savages of the most opposite climates have all but one character of improvidence and rapacity; and tutored nations, however separate, make use of the very same methods to procure refined enjoyment.'

Nations, in truth, in their intercourse with one another know but the two great languages—of war and commerce. And in obedience to some subtle law of national affinities, there seems to be an irresistible impulse among States to cultivate intimate relations either martial or mercantile, through the medium of cotton bales or cannon-balls; the latter being often but an alternative—*on se bat — faute de s'entendre*. Nature, which abhors Dictionaries with the intensity of a Scaliger, provides those two-fold symbols of communication peaceful and aggressive,—of which the Hyde Park Building furnishes so varied a repertory,—as a counterpoise to the barbarising influences of diverse tongues. The Birmingham hatchet, with one end of which the Cherokee Indian scalps his enemy, whilst with the other he placidly smokes his dried leaves, becomes the harbinger of civilisation, just as the gibbet, seen by the French voyager on a desolate coast, assured him of the milder manners of the inhabitants.

Voluntary isolation is now regarded as a crime, and the great Powers of the present day are constantly casting about on the world's chart in search of some land, hitherto jealously guarded against all intrusion. They seem to resent such reserve, as a slight on the co-operative tendencies of the age, and on the comity of nations, and hasten to chastise the pride, which isolation has at once engendered and rendered feeble. We seek out the rude Islanders of the Pacific and barter our varied wares for the oil of the sperm whale, and, by its light, plan new schemes of conquest and colonisation. On the banks of the Senegal and the Gambia we contend with France in cultivating the friendship of the native kings, converting their royal realms into factories of gum or the juice of the palm nut; and we tempt King Dahomey to deck with the industrial products of his slaves a stall in the World's Fair in Hyde Park.

It has often been a subject of regret that on so few of our ancient maps do we find the great commercial routes laid down, by which the amber-merchant in the east, and the tin-merchant in the west, travelled in search of these so sparingly scattered

minerals; — such routes marked side by side with the itineraries of the great conquerors could not fail of suggesting interesting comparisons. We should be enabled to trace back the civilisation of the world to the motives of its first disseminators, and measure the relative influence of gain and glory on the destinies of Empires. How often has it happened that some trivial article of commerce has changed the face of kingdoms. England may be said to owe her great Indian empire to a free-trade feeling in 1620 in favour of pepper. For her Chinese trade and prospects, she is in a measure indebted to her preference of tea to opium. And it would be indeed hazardous at present to predict the wondrous social effects which lie still concealed in the flocculent bulbs of the bombax gossypium and the other species of the cotton plant.

It would be well could we at the same time indicate those changing lines along which the crusades of creed have swept. The same impulse that carried the followers of Mahomet from Mecca beyond the Pyrenees, still carries the Mormon over the Rocky Mountains; and as science is indebted to those Arab philosophers for the uses of the alembic, we may perhaps derive a similar advantage from the followers of the Californian prophet, in learning new uses of the crucible. But the influences of religious enthusiasm have ever been more of a qualifying than a direct character, and have always partaken as largely of the commercial as the military quality. Where the pilgrim halted the pedlar bartered; and the great fairs of Germany seek their origin, as the term *Messen*, or *Masses*, still indicates, in those mediæval gatherings of the pious, for the joint purpose of assisting at the holy offices of the Church, and supplying their other than strictly spiritual wants.

In estimating the future influences of commerce it is necessary to bear in mind the novel combinations and appliances which modern science has placed at its disposal. The diplomacy of trade at the present day is as unlike the commercial negotiation of bygone times, as the armament of our steel-clad warriors little resembles the equipments of our modern soldiery. The pedlar, caravanseries, and the fair, have given place to the commercial traveller, the railroad, and the book of patterns. And the Industrial Exhibition itself may be regarded as the next stage, constituting not more a display of the products themselves, than of the capabilities of the producer.

When considering the immediate effects of the Exhibition in relation to its great instructive purpose, it is necessary to bear in mind, that little there exhibited claims to be new in the absolute sense of the word. Comparatively, few of the articles contributed to any of the several departments have



been specially designed or created for the purpose of exposition: the great majority, however, though well known to particular classes, are still perfectly new to the great mass of visitors. Most of the American inventions, which have deservedly attracted so large a share of attention, have been long known in Europe. Mr. Mac Cormick's reaping-machine, and Mr. Hobb's lock, have both already graced provincial Exhibitions, if we are not mistaken, even in Austria. But this very circumstance is the best proof of the practical value of the present enterprise. So slow are we to incur the responsibility of adopting the results of empiric talent, that it is only in the concentrated light of a Crystal Palace, with the full blaze of the world's recognition of merit illumining our judgment, that we venture on the outlay or the change in our old established procedures incidental to new inventions. It has been sometimes urged that little practical value is to be derived from so extended a field of observation, where the attention is distracted by the multifariousness of the examination and the variety of the objects claiming notice. But the *dilettant*, seeking mere general information, is affected in a way altogether different from the man with a distinct purpose, and in pursuit of some special branch of knowledge. It is very remarkable that almost the only failure which the Commission have to lament, was the attempt to give instruction in the form of lectures. These failed from the paucity of visitors, whose reliance on their eyes in the scrutiny of minute adaptations did not render them indifferent to the generalisations of the lecturer. The following remarks from a New York paper will, however, show in what way our Transatlantic brethren view this point.

'The Exhibition is destined to contribute immensely to the industrial and practical education of the British people. Of a million who come to gaze, only a hundred thousand may come with any clear idea of profiting by the show, and but half of those succeed in carrying back more wisdom than they brought here; yet even those are quite an army, and fifty thousand skilled artisans, or sharp-eyed apprentices, viewing such an exposition aright, and going home to ponder and dream upon it, cannot fail of working out great triumphs. The British mind is more fertile in improvement than in absolute invention, as is here demonstrated, especially in the Department of Machinery; and the simple adaption of the forces now attained, the principles established, the machines already invented, to all the beneficent uses of which they are capable, would speedily transform the industrial and social condition of mankind. I am perfectly satisfied for example, that boots and shoes may be cut out and made by machinery with less than one fourth the labour now required,—that this would require no absolutely new inventions, but only an adaption of those already well known. So in other departments of industry.'

To the other incidental effects we must add the extraordinary diffusion of at least the elements of industrial knowledge, through the medium of our public journals and the legion of guides, handbooks, catalogues, and illustrated publications of all kind, which have given a wholesome and instructive tone to our humblest class of literature. There can, also, be little doubt that the moral effect has been highly satisfactory : —

‘The idea,’ says Sir John Herschel \*, ‘once conceived and verified that great and noble ends are to be achieved, by which the condition of the whole human species shall be permanently bettered, by bringing into exercise a sufficient quantity of sober thought, and, by a proper adaptation of means, is of itself sufficient to set us earnestly on reflecting what ends are truly great and noble either in themselves, or as conducive to others of a still loftier character, because we are not now as heretofore hopeless of attaining them. . . For why should we despair that the reason which has enabled us to subdue all nature to our purposes, should (if permitted and assisted by the Providence of God) achieve a far more difficult purpose ; and ultimately find some means of enabling the collective wisdom of mankind to bear down those obstacles which individual short-sightedness, selfishness and passion, oppose to all improvements, and by which the highest hopes are continually blighted, and the fairest prospects marred.’

The day may be yet far distant when Minerva shall lay aside her lance, or when we shall be fortunate enough to number war — if we may be permitted to continue the metaphor — among the dead languages ; but it cannot be doubted that even the many improvements in projectiles and fire-arms, of which the Exhibition offers not a few, are all steps in the path of peace. We are continually, by such means, increasing the distance between the combatants, and placing them less in opposition to the personal prowess and passions of their adversaries than to the laws of inorganic matter. War is becoming a mere problem for the laboratory—a question of the relative expansive powers of certain gases ; and the results of future campaigns are likely to depend much less on the strategy of the commanders than on the combination of chemical knowledge and mechanical skill in perfecting the Prussian needle-gun or Minier’s rifle.

What can serve as a happier illustration of the pacific tendencies of our progress, or of the reluctance of science to become the handmaid of war, than the recent discoveries in chemical science in connexion with the *xylicate* of cotton, and flax, the latter of which has attracted so much attention, and obtained so wide a scrutiny through the medium of the present Exhibition ?

---

\* Discourse on the Study of Natural Philosophy.

A few years since the world learned with surprise, almost with dismay, that the most terrible engine of human destruction lay in the explosive qualities of the cotton-fibre, which had hitherto formed the staple of our peaceful industry. But experience soon established the fact that, however applicable the extraordinary powers of M. Schönbein's gun-cotton to the purposes of industrial progress,—the blasting of rocks, the cutting of tunnels, the deepening of mines,—it was little suited to the purposes of warfare. Its indirect application to industrial purposes have been many, and among the most recent, is the silvering process of the Daguerreotype. This year the similar explosive qualities of the flax-fibre has received at the hands of M. Claussen an application, which promises for his flax-cotton, in its peaceful uses, a more enlarged sphere of influence than the gun-cotton of M. Schönbein ever affected to attain. M. Claussen steeps his flax in an alkaline solution, and on the subsequent application of sulphuric acid, explodes every fibre of the mass by means of the carbonic acid gas evolved, rendering the entire substance applicable, from the delicacy of its fibre, to the manipulation of our ordinary cotton machinery. In this way, it would seem, that after having by successive improvements in mechanism attained a rare perfection in the action of our machinery, we summon chemical science to complete by the adaptation of new products, what mere mechanical action could hardly hope to accomplish.

On the ultimate results of M. Claussen's invention, and the economic value of his discovery, it is as yet impossible to decide. But through the publicity which the subject has gained, and the thorough scrutiny to which it has been subjected, there is little fear of its value being unappreciated, or its character remaining long untested. We cannot forbear here alluding to the kindred discovery of Mr. Mercer, which may be regarded as a further step in the same direction, and which stands in intimate connexion with this summoning of chemistry to perform those delicate offices, which the grosser qualities of mechanism attempt in vain. By steeping a piece of common calico in a solution of soda, Mr. Mercer gives a fineness to the texture—from the contraction of the parts—which, besides heightening the dyeing properties of the material, enables him to raise figured surfaces at will, by merely guarding them against the contracting properties of the alkali. For this discovery we are indebted to the present Exhibition—as it was the desire to produce something new for it which fortunately in this instance led to the resumption of inquiries long laid aside. The next virgin discovery, of which the Exposition has to boast, is one which comes before it in so unpretending a form that it

might easily escape,—and, in truth, had nearly escaped the observation of the most inquisitive.

The last Number, 220., section 2. of the present edition of the Catalogue, mentions the models of some Lucifer-matches made with amorphous phosphorus. The uninformed reader would hardly guess that this simple statement involves the solution of one of the most curious problems of Vulcanic chemistry, and indicates results of equal importance to commerce and philanthropy. The production and commercial uses of this mysterious body have been hitherto checked by the fearful disease its subtle absorption into the system produces, and by the dangers attending its transport or storage, as it ignites at the temperature of a warm summer-day. The conversion of phosphorus from a crystallised into an amorphous form, strips this dangerous substance of its highly inflammable and poisonous qualities: but, in doing so deprives it of none of its useful properties. At the same time, the fact of this being wrought by a simple change in the arrangement of its constituent atoms, gives us an insight into a series of phenomena equally new and important. Whilst looking at the dull brown amorphous mass, of which a piece now lies before us, and comparing it with the straw-coloured crystallised form, we are no longer surprised at the succession of changes in the internal structure of carbon, from soot to graphite or the diamond. Concerning the entire identity of the amorphous and crystallised phosphorus, there can be no room for doubt, as we can at will reproduce either form from the other, without the addition of any new matter whatever. We have reason to think that the distinguished scholar to whom we owe this important discovery, Professor Schrötter, the Secretary of the Academy of Sciences at Vienna, is not without strong hopes of speedily resolving some of the other elementary crystallised substances into a similarly amorphous state. Such of our readers as desire further information on the subject, will do well to consult the Monograph of the author, and the last edition of the Chemical letters of Baron Liebig, who has already ventured to suggest that many of the minerals composing the crust of the earth may be but different crystallisations of one and the same body.

We must add, that the amorphous matches now lying on our table, of which models only were admissible into the Exhibition, were not produced until within a very few weeks of its closing; and might, in all probability, owing to the accidental failure of the first experiments, have remained long a mere scientific possibility, had not the stimulant of a world-wide fame spurred the manufacturer on to a repetition of the experiment.

This is neither the time nor place to discuss the bearing of the rival capabilities displayed on the great question of national competition. We must await the publication of the Reports of the juries before we can form any such opinion. But we may venture to state, on the authority of the collective whisperings of the deciding body, that the commerce of each country is being gradually forced into paths far beyond the influence of mere geographical distribution. The opinion seems also gaining ground that the most perfect system of Navigation Laws may co-exist with very imperfect laws of naval architecture, and that the reliance on the bolts and guards of a protective system, however venerable or intricate, may prove as delusive on emergency as the complicated virtues of Mr. Chubb's lock in the hands of a Mr. Hobbs. The opponents of free trade were in a great measure its conscientious opponents; and we feel bound to admit that the result fully justifies their sagacity according to their generation. Nasmyth's steam-hammer, Penn's engines, the Britannia hydraulic press, and the building itself, have, we understand, made converts in high places abroad on the subject of duties on iron, which occupies with the great 'country party' on the Continent the place which corn occupies amongst our own.

Were we to presume to hazard an opinion on the general character of the discoveries with which this Exhibition has made us familiar, we should say, that the direction they indicate is such as might be expected from this age—the successful effort to supersede mechanical by chemical agency. The three discoveries already alluded to, and others, such as Mr. Young's solidified gas or paraffine from coal, as well as the endless improvements in electro-magnetism,—all point in the same direction. They indicate at the same time the path in which each nation will have to tread to avoid being distanced in the race of industrial competition. The competition of intellect is displacing that of matter; and the votaries of protective duties will have just cause of pride if they succeed in sustaining, even with the highest tariff-power, branches of industry which have to compete with such rivals as a simple chemical discovery creates; for instance, such as amongst ourselves, the power of extracting soda from salt, coupled with the means of utilising muriatic acid through the agency of *gutta percha*—a substance which promises to effect for the chemistry of manufactures what *platinum* has already done for analytic science.

Whatever else the results of this Exhibition prove—and it is far from easy to prognosticate the future—it will have served a large and national purpose in enlightening the world on the real condition and character of the inhabitants of this country. For

some years past a flood of mendacious literature has poured in upon the Continent, misrepresenting and vilifying the habits, pursuits, feelings, and social condition of our producing classes. Six months of the most searching scrutiny, of an examination conducted by large sections of the populations, on whom these falsehoods have been foisted, constitute the best, and perhaps the only form of vindication which could have proved successful. We cannot envy the feelings of the fallen republican chieftain, M. Ledru Rollin, whilst assisting at the wondrous inauguration of this temple, and reflecting how strange a contrast the scene around him offered to the pictures and predictions of his work on the state of this country. It will have proved on the widest scale, and in the least controvertible form, that all sections of our population combine the most indomitable energy with the most ingrained love of order and respect for their own institutions. It is also worthy of remark, as very creditable to the advanced intelligence and manly bearing of the working classes of this country, that no feelings of jealousy seemed any where to prevail, nor any memory to exist of the many hardships and wrongs to which their brethren had been subjected within a recent period in France. The only instance of violence was that regrettable one to which we have already alluded; but which had more of a strictly ethical than political character. It has been atoned for. As a people we are incapable of malice. Hardly was the building half finished when the popular humour pronounced the gigantic equestrian statue of the redoubtable Godfrey de Bouillon, the chivalrous leader of the first Crusade, to be the effigy of the misused marshal. And the popular *amende* may be said more particularly to have lain in the suggestion, that the huge Flemish steed of the simulated hero was supplied from the sleek stock of the peccant Firm, within whose domain the act had been perpetrated, as an atonement for an offence, — to reach which even Prince Schwarzenberg's familiarity with the defects of our criminal law failed to suggest an effective form of procedure.

In conclusion let us observe, that as few designs ever awakened more alarm at its outset, or ever inspired greater apprehensions for its success during its progress, so in the same proportion have few realisations been more complete, and no consummation more pregnant, we would believe, with lasting good. It may be a matter of difficulty to apportion the exact degree in which all engaged partake of the advantages, or share its honours. But we would fain believe that few with a capacity for improvement have not gained instruction, — and few susceptible of pleasure have not derived enjoyment. They are equally

few, we believe, who will not partake directly or indirectly of its fruits—for as it is the curse of evil ever to propagate evil, so we believe it to be the property of all things inherently good to generate what is good. If all sources of judgment be not fallacious, all classes have increased their stock of knowledge, —enlarged the sphere of their enjoyments, cultivated new and instructive relations, exercised their national hospitality, confirmed their loyalty, and this — without increasing our bills of mortality, or adding to our calendars of crime.

---

#### NOTE TO ART. VI. OF THE LAST NUMBER.

IN the Article headed ‘ Sir E. L. Bulwer Lytton’s Letters to ‘ John Bull, Esq.,’ which appeared in the last number of the Review, we were undesignedly led into the error of supposing that Sir Edward Lytton had at one time held opinions on the subject of a free-trade in corn, different from those which he maintains at present; in palliation of which error we can only say, that we held it in common, we believe, with a large portion of the public. Our general arguments are in no degree affected by our misconception of the steadiness of Sir Edward’s personal convictions upon the question : but we cannot correct our error without expressing our unfeigned regret at having, however unintentionally, misrepresented a gentleman to whom the literary world is under so many obligations.

## I N D E X.

## A

*Accidents, fatal*; how far preventible. See *Fatal Accidents*.

*Anglo-Catholic Theory* (the), review of books relating to, 527—the Ecclesiastical Titles Bill, 528—its results, *ib.*—Popery to be met by Faith in Protestantism, 529—Lord Shaftesbury and Church reform, 530—the Tractarian or Anglo-Catholic Party, *ib.*—not extinguished by the secessions to Rome, 531-2—the Authority of the Church the cause of secessions, 533—extract from the Duke of Argyll's letter to the Bishop of Oxford, *ib.*—Church Principles detrimental to the Church of England, 534-6—the Anglo-Catholic theory of the Church, 537—want of an exclusive right or charter for the claims and prerogatives of Episcopacy, 538-9—the Romanist doctrine of Infallibility, 539-40—the Anglo-Catholic Church neither catholic nor united, 540-1—Anglo-Catholic view of the Reformation, 541-2—the Church of England not the work of the English clergy, 543—but of King and Parliament, 544-5—decrees of Convocation no basis for Anglo-Catholicism, 545—Church of England not built on Church Principles, but on a right of private judgment, 546-8—Bishop Philpott's idea of a 'National Church', 549-50—right of private judgment for every bishop, 551-2—'the Church' a mere nonentity as to authoritatively settling doctrine, *ib.*—Anglo-Catholicism must concede right of private judgment to the laity, 552-3—the Bishop of Exeter's assertion that 'we did not shake off Rome, but that Rome shook us off,' examined, 554—importance of knowing the consequences of Anglo-Catholicism, 555—the Bishop of Exeter and Bishop Jewell, *ib.*—between Protestant principles and an infallible Church there is no middle way, 556—extract from the Duke of Argyll's pamphlet, 556-7—remarks on the work, 557.

*Apuleius, Metamorphoses of*. See *Metamorphoses of Apuleius*.

## C

*Chemistry, Modern*. See *Modern Chemistry*.

*Coleridge, Hartley*. See *Hartley Coleridge*.

*Comparative Philology*; review of Professor Bopp's *Comparative Grammar of the Sanskrit, Zend, Greek, Latin, Lithuanian, Gothic, German, and Slavonic Languages*, 297—modern date of *Comparative Philology*, *ib.*—Müller and Humboldt on the importance of the new science, 298, and *note*—difference between *Philology* and



Comparative Philology, 299—necessity of an historical method of studying languages, 300—growth of cognate languages, 301-2—comparison of cognate languages, 303—use of classifying languages, 304—superficial classification of languages, 305—Dr. Latham 'On the Varieties of Man,' 306-7, and *note*—Ethnological results of Comparative Philology, 307—Dr. Prichard 'On the various Methods of Research,' &c., 307-8—on the spelling of Tartar instead of Tatar, 308, *note*—common origin of languages, 309—Arian family of languages, 310-1—members of the Arian family, 312-3, and *note*—the Ossetic languages, 313—Drs. Rosen and Latham, 314, and *note*—origin of the name 'Arian,' 314-5—Arian and Sanskrit, 316—relation of Sanskrit to the other Arian languages, 317—examples in the declensions of Sanskrit, Greek, Latin, Gothic, and Old High German, 318-20—'Lautverschiebung,' 319—the Greek 'brother,' 320-1, *note*—Chevalier Bunsen's theory, 321—numerals and their accents, 322—the Pronouns, 323,—the conjugation of Verbs, 324-5—the word 'amanini,' 325-6—historical results of Comparative Philology, 327-8—vestiges of language, 329—the origin of the word to express the idea of God, 329-30—languages, both ancient and modern, considered as historical documents, 330-1, *notes*—antiquity of modern language, 331—the original Sclavonic, Indian, Teutonic, Greek, and Latin word for 'God,' 331-8—Sir George Staunton's 'Inquiry into the proper 'mode of rendering the word 'God' in translating the Scriptures 'into the Chinese language,' 337-8, *note*—Comparative Grammar addresses itself both to the Philosopher and the Historian, 339.

## D

*Dennistoun, James*, review of his 'Memoirs of the Dukes of Urbino' illustrating the Arms, Arts, and Literature of Italy from 1440 to '1630,' 339—general ignorance, on the part of the reading public, of Urbino's dukes, *ib.*—satisfactory manner in which Mr. Dennistoun has handled his subject, 340—his observations on Art, 341—Raphael, Tasso, and Majolica, *ib.*—Urbino, 342—the lords of Montefeltro, 343-4—the Condottiere system, 344-5—extract illustrating it, 345-6—Duke Oddantonio, 347—Duke Federigo, 348—abroad, 349-50—at home, 351—extracts giving traits of his character and incidents in his life, 351-3—Duke Guidabaldo the First, 353—Castiglione and the Cortegiano, 354-6—Castiglione's Court-gentleman and Court-lady, 357-8—Lucrezia Borgia, 359—remarks on the 'Manners of the times under notice, 360—Duke Francesco Maria the First, 361—Duke Guidabaldo the Second, 362—Duke Francesco Maria the Second, *ib.*—his son Federigo, 363—Urbino under the Dukes, *ib.*—their claims to be considered patrons of literature examined, 364-5.

*Dixon (W. H.)*, his *Life of Penn*, review of, 229—extract from the Author's Preface, *ib.*—strictures upon his mode of treating his subject, 230—George Fox, the preacher of the inward light, 231-2—Penn, the preacher of religious freedom, 233-4—and the Wilberforce of his age, 235—Penn wanting in 'strong sense,' according to Macaulay,

235-6, and *note*—trial of Penn<sup>r</sup> and Mead on the Conventicle Act, 237-8—Mr. Dixon's remarks thereon, 239—Penn's pertinacity, 239-40—the alliance between James II. and Penn, 241—Macaulay's views thereof, 242—probable cause thereof, *ib.*—unpopularity of Penn on account of being the 'King's Friend,' 243—Mr. Foster's pamphlet 'William Penn and T. B. Macaulay,' *ib.*—Penn loses influence among his own Society, 244—the 'Penn Controversy,' *ib.* *note*—the George Penn of the Pinney Cash Book, 245—extract giving an account of Pennsburg and the style of living there, 246-7—Penn not a rigid Quaker as to dress, 247—his loss of fortune in Pennsylvania, 248-9—enormous increase in value of his property there, 250—Penn's equanimity under misfortune and trouble, *ib.*—his domestic life, 251—his family, 251-2—remarks on Mr. Dixon's qualifications as a biographer, 252—Penn's confidence in human nature, 253.

## F

*Fatal Accidents*, how far preventible; review of Parliamentary returns, 98—registrar-general's reports, 99, and *note*, 100—expense of preventive measures, 101—deaths by violence in England and in France, 102, and *note*—gambling propensity of human nature, 103—loss of life at the Dunlop Street Theatre, Glasgow, 104—risks natural and artificial, 105-6—edifices unnecessarily dangerous, 107-8—steamers: the Orion, 109—railway constructions, 111-2—the Railway Board, and its circulars, 113-4—collision at Cowlairs and the Sutton Tunnel, 115,—at Woodlesford and the Blackheath Tunnel, 116—insufficiency of instructions and of staff, 117-8—frequent recklessness of contractors, 119-20—defective register of accidents in mines, 121-2—reports of Mining Commissioners, 123-4—factories; and factory inspectors, 124-5—falling in of buildings from fractures of iron beams, 126—science a protection to the lives and health of the public, 127.

## G

*Great Exhibition*, Official Catalogue of. See *Official Catalogue*.

*Greek Text* of the New Testament, review of works upon, 1-2—Mr. Alford's New Testament, 2-3—his critical revision of the Greek text, 3—the Elzevir, Complutensian, and 'Received Text' editions, 4, and *notes*—variations of ancient MSS. from the 'Received Text,' 5, and *notes*—Dr. Mill's edition, and his ideas respecting an Italian version, 5-6, and *notes*—obstacles to his original design, 7—value of collating the variations furnished by ancient MSS. and versions, 8—Bentley's letter to Archbishop Wake, 8-12—Bentley's zeal in carrying out his designs, 12—sends over John Walker to Paris, *ib.*—Bentley's designs mistaken by the Benedictines, 13—his dispute with the Fellows of Trinity College, Cambridge, and abandonment of his proposed edition, 14—new collations since Bentley's time, 15-6—corruptions early detected, 17, and *note*—examples of detected corruptions, 18-20—a comparison of the Evangelists a cause of corruption, 21—no corruption of doctrinal importance introduced into versions

of the New Testament, 22—Jerôme's principle of a reformed text, 23—his materials principally Alexandrine Greek MSS., *ib.*—use of Coptic and Syrian MSS., and also of Latin versions, 24—the more modern Greek MSS., 25—outline of the course to be pursued in order to insure critical accuracy, 26-7—Lachmann's Greek and Latin New Testament, 27-8—his method generally satisfactory, 29—Tischendorf's Greek New Testament, 29-30—his transcripts of ancient MSS., 31—alteration of Greek MSS. from Latin ones, 32-3—illustrative examples, 33-4—Alford's *Apparatus Criticus* of little use, 35-6—his *Prolegomena*, 36—a Hebrew original of St. Matthew examined, 37-8—all accounts reducible to one or two sources, 39—influence of St. Peter on St. Mark's Gospel, 40, and *notes*—final paragraph of St. Mark uncertain, 41—Alford's views respecting the authorship of the Gospels, 41-3—supplementary theory of St. John's Gospels, 43—oral tradition, 43-4—Apostolic Scripture the foundation of faith, 45-6.

*Grote's History of Greece*, review of, 204—the Peloponnesian War, 205-6—Mr. Grote's style, 207-8—history considered on positive principles, 209-10—Mr. Grote and Dr. Arnold, 211-2—questions of history, party questions, 213-4—the rehabilitation of Cleon, 215-20—nature of Droysen's defence of Cleon, 221-2—as regards Cleon, Thucydides or Grote? 223, and *note*—the Sophists, 224—can they be defended? 225-7—closing remarks, 228.

## II

*Hartley Coleridge*, review of works by, 64—his early sensitiveness of temperament, 65—poetic greetings from his father, Wordsworth, and Southey, 66—his metaphysical tendencies, 67—his early friends, 68—his ideal world, 69-70—his day-dreaming, and its injurious effects upon his poetry, 71-2—his Oxford life, 73-4—his 'Worthies of Yorkshire and Lancashire,' 75—death of his father, 76—his later life and death, 77-8—his sonnets, 79-81—true-heartedness of his poetry, 82—its expression of the poet's personal being, 83—his lines on an 'Infant's Hands,' 84-5—selection from his poems, 85-7—religion a latent element in his poetry, 87-8—moral excellence of his poetry, 88-9—his descriptive, humorous, and philosophical powers, 90-1—his sonnets on 'Liberty' and on 'Fear,' 92—his poetry on Scriptural subjects, 93-4—his deficiency of strength and completeness in conception, 95—general remarks, 96-7.

*Hungary*, Pulszky's *Tales and Traditions of*. See *Pulszky's Tales*, &c.

## J

*John Bull*, Letters to. See *Lytton* (Sir E. L. Bulwer).

*Johnston* (James, F. W.), review of his *Notes on North America*, 46—British North America, 47—cause of Mr. Johnston's visit, 48—New Brunswick, 48-9—decline of its lumber trade, and disastrous state of the colony, 49—illustrated by extracts and note, 49-52—evils of Protection experienced at New Brunswick, 52—Great success of industrious emigrants, 53 and *note*—statistical details, 54

—who ought to emigrate, 55, and *note*—deterioration of second generation of settlers, 55-6—explanation of success of Irish emigrants, 57-8—wheat-exporting power of North America, 59-60—energy of Canadians, 61-2—cry of ‘annexation,’ 63-4.

*Juvenile Delinquency*, review of works treating of, 403—what is to be done with our juvenile delinquents? 403-4—statistical statement, 404—vital importance of the subject, 405—probable career of a juvenile offender, 405-6—necessity of better educating the young of the lower classes, 407-8—cheap concerts, shows, and theatres, 409-10—marine store-dealers, 411—comparative amount of juvenile delinquency in the manufacturing, mining, and agricultural districts, 412—Union Houses, and the Bridgnorth Union School, 412-3—different systems of penal treatment adopted in England and France with regard to juvenile delinquents, 414-6—Mr. Osborne, the chaplain of Bath Gaol, 416-7—Mr. Rushton of Liverpool, 417—Parkhurst Reformatory School, 418—comparative cost of a reformatory system and one merely of punishment, 419—necessity of making the nature and objects of schools of correction and reformation unmistakeable, 420-1—Mr. Adderley’s pamphlet, 421—the parents or friends of a juvenile delinquent must contribute to his support in the reformatory school, 422—Miss Carpenter’s ‘Reformatory Schools,’ 423—MM. De Lurieu and Romand on ‘Les ‘Colonies Agricoles de Mendians,’ &c., 424, *note*—the correctional school of Mettray, 425-6—of Rhusyllede near Ghent, 427-8—those of Switzerland, 428, and *notes*—of America, 428-9.

## L

*Lytton* (Sir E. L. Bulwer), his ‘Letters to John Bull,’ review of, 140—conversion of the author to the ranks of the Protectionists, 140-1—M. Guerry’s tables, 141—fallacies of Sir E. L. Bulwer Lytton’s positions, 142—who support the surplus rural population? 143-4—who support the clergy? 145—the land-tax, 145-6—dear corn injurious to the labourer, 147-8—English silks: French cotton and iron, 149—‘protection to native industry,’ 150—true protection *versus* false protection, 151—Adam Smith unfairly quoted, 152-3—nature of Adam Smith’s misapprehension, 153—Protection no stimulus to production, 154—low prices a stimulus to it, 155—the misery or well-being of the masses dependent in great measure on the scarcity or abundance of food, 156—Rev. Mr. Harris on Mile End New Town, 156-7—effect of import duties upon home manufacture, 158—the glove trade specified as an example, 159—desirableness of doing away with all duties upon foreign manufactures, 159-60—advantages of the English farmer, 160-1—Ireland under Protection and under Free Trade, 161-2—effect of damaged grain on the averages, 163—principles which govern rent in farming, 164—comparative burdens on land in this and other countries, 165—means of raising remunerative crops, 166—the growth of flax, &c.—disproportion of farms to capital, 167—danger of recurring to Protection, and thereby enhancing prices, 168—effect of reductions in the Customs and Excise, 169—increase in British

shipping, 170-2—cheapening of British shipbuilding, 173-4—Criminal returns from 1846 to 1850, 175-6.

## M

*Metamorphoses of Apuleius*, review of Sir George Head's translation of, 472—the Milesian Tales, 473—sketch of the story, 474—Lucius and the two travellers, *ib.*—Milo the money-lender, 475—Pamphile and Fotis, 475-6—the trial of Lucius for murder, 477—Lucius metamorphosed into an ass, *ib.*—his stay with the robbers, 478—his connexion with a band of mendicant priests, 478-80—is bought by a baker, 480—his master's slaves and wife, 480-1—is taken into the service of a market-gardener, 481-2—passes into the hands of a rich Corinthian, 482-3—assists in the representation of the 'Judgment of Paris,' at Corinth, 483—escapes thence, and prays to Isis to restore him to the human form, *ib.*—the procession in honour of Isis, 483-4—his transformation reversed, 484—initiated into the mysteries of Isis, 484-5—Apuleius the subject of a theological discussion from the second to the fourth century, 485-6—*the personal history of Apuleius*, 487-8—his 'Apology,' 488-9—his Latinity, 489.

*Mirabeau's Correspondence*—review of 'Correspondance entre le Comte de Mirabeau et le Comte de la Marck, pendant les années 1789, 1790, et 1791,' &c., 430—resemblances in the Revolutions of 1789 and 1848, *ib.*—Louis XVI. and Louis Philippe, *ib.*—Mirabeau's first appearance in the hall of the States General, 431—his interview with M. Necker, *ib.*—his memorable reply to a command from Louis XVI. for the Three Orders to dissolve, 432—the Constituent Assembly, 432-3—committee to prepare the project of the Constitution, 433—correspondence with the Comte de la Marck, 433-4—the Comte de la Marck's character of Marie Antoinette, 434—of La Fayette, *ib.*—of the Duke of Orleans, 435—his first impressions of Mirabeau, *ib.*—conversation between him and Mirabeau, 436-7—Mirabeau's principles monarchical, 437—his advice to the King, 438—his low estimate of La Fayette, 438-9—the King pays his debts, and allows him 6000 francs a month, 440—his first interview with the Queen, *ib.*—his illness and death, 441—his slowness in written composition, 442—the King brought back to Paris by the populace, 442—Marie Antoinette's letter to Comte de Mercy, 442—letter from Mirabeau to the Comte de Montmorin, 444—correspondence between Mirabeau, the Comte de la Marck, and La Fayette, 445-6—letter from the Marquise de Saillant, Mirabeau's sister, to his wife the Comtesse de Mirabeau, 446-7—extracts from his letters, 448—his first and second letters to the Queen, 449—his interview with the Queen at St. Cloud, 450—he recommends the King and Queen to leave Paris, 451—various suggestions offered by him, 451-4—offends the Court, 451-5—reiterates his devotion to the cause of order and the monarchy, 455—Mirabeau by turns very great and very weak, 456—La Fayette's coarse language to the Queen, *ib.*—Madame La Motte, 457—Mirabeau's amendment in the National Assembly respecting the

annexation of Avignon, 458—his connexion with the Comte de Montmorin, 458-9—his forty-seventh-note to the Court, 460-2—its expediency and practicability considered, 463—document implicating the Queen and the King's brother, 464—Mirabeau's want of prudence, 465—his popularity undiminished, *ib.*—correspondence between the Comte de la Marck and the Comte Mercy, 466—Mirabeau appointed President of the Assembly, 467—his plan of getting the King and Queen safely out of Paris, *ib.*—his speech against the project of law affecting the emigrants, 468—his success as a speaker both in the Assembly and at the Jacobin Club, 468—his dislike of MM. Talon, Semonville, and Duquesnoy, 468-9—his last speech, 469—the full influence of his talents and eloquence on the Revolution never manifested, 470—Memoirs of Mallet du Pan, *ib.*—Mirabeau, though immoral and licentious, a consistent and honest politician? *ib.*—his false position, 470-1—his secret relations with the Court, 471—M. Bacourt, *ib.*

*Modern Chemistry*; its Progress and Extent, review of works relating to, 254-5—rapid and extensive progress in the study of the science, 255-7—illustrated both by the numerous modern publications on, and investigators of, Chemistry, 257-8—Berzelius, 258—his early life, 259-61—discoveries made by him, 262-3—new elementary bodies, 263-4—relations of Chemistry to Mineralogy, 265-6—use of the blow-pipe in Chemistry, 267—application of chemical knowledge by Humphry Davy to explain natural phenomena, 268-9—later chemical geologists, 269-70—progress of Organic Chemistry, 271-4—compound radicals, 274-6—changing theories and nomenclatures, 276-7—discovery of organic alkalies, 278-9—chemical compounds, 279-80—chemical physiology, 281-2—the physiology and school of Liebig, 283-5—objectionable course pursued at Giessen, 285—Curative Chemistry, 286—Sanatory Chemistry, 287-8—Forensic Chemistry, 289-90—application of Chemistry to the arts of life, 290-2—wide domain and usefulness of Chemistry, 293-6.

## N

*Neapolitan Justice*, review of works concerning recent occurrences at Naples, 490—iniquities of the government, 491—how far his Sicilian Majesty is responsible for the evils of his ministers, *ib.* and *note*—Englishmen hard of belief in cases of foreign oppression and injustice, 492—Mr. Gladstone at Naples, *ib.*—his resolution of publishing some of the unjust and oppressive acts he there witnessed, 493—his Letters to Lord Aberdeen, 494-5—Pierio, Settembrini, and others accused of belonging to a secret Society called Unità Italiana, 496—extract showing the absurdity of the charge and the iniquitous mode of trial, 496-7—Angelillo, the State prosecutor, 498—extracts showing his unfair mode of conducting a prosecution, 498-9—persecution suffered by Luigi Settembrini, 500, and *note*—some account of him in 1848-9, 501—extract from Mr. Gladstone's First Letter to Lord Aberdeen showing up the spy system, 501-2—extracts from Settembrini respecting *Jerusalem*

and Angelillo, 502-3—Mr. Gladstone's charge, against the Government fully borne out by Settembrini, 505-6—extracts showing the unfair and cruel mode adopted towards political prisoners, 506-9—extracts giving an account of Poerio and the pretended letter of Dragonetti, 510-1—the trial of political offenders a mere mockery in the Neapolitan Courts, 512—letter from Settembrini to his wife, when expecting to be condemned to death (extract), 513-4—horrible state of the prisons, 515-6, and *note*—the 'defence' put forth by the Neapolitan Government, 516-7—Mr. Macfarlane, 517—number of State prisoners, 517-8—O'Raredon and his book, 519—its numerous blunders, 520—the King of Naples pledged to clemency for the affair of May, 1848, 521—but forfeits his pledge in 1851, 521-2—Mr. Baillie Cochrane, M.P. for Bridport, and his 'Young Italy,' 522—has an interview with, and tenders suggestions to, the King of Naples, 522-3—Mr. Cochrane's little regard to truth in relating facts, 523—his ignorance of French and Italian, *ib.*—his false statements respecting Lord Minto, 524-6—remarks on apologies for the Neapolitan Government in a leading publication, 526-8, *note*.

*New Testament*, Greek Text of the. See *Greek Text*, &c.

*North America*, Johnston's Notes on. See *Johnston*.

*Note to Art. VI.* in last Number, 598.

## O

*Official Catalogue* of the Great Exhibition, review of, 557—a kind of encyclopædia, 558—its ambiguity and inaccuracies, *ib.*—accounted for and explained, 558-9—interesting statistics respecting 559—number of copies of *Official Catalogue* in circulation, 560—and of ten of the largest libraries in the world, *ib.*, *note*—probable impetus that the Exhibition will give to literature generally, 560—liberality and exactitude with which the publishers have fulfilled their contract, 560-1—dangers of the contract system, 561—Edmund Burke on contracts, *ib.*—the project of the Great Exhibition first entertained, 561-2—growing popularity of exhibitions of this nature, 563—the Paris Exposition in 1849, *ib.*—M. Buffet's circular, *ib.*—early history of the Great Exhibition, 563-5—difficulties encountered, 566-7—indifference at home: political convulsion abroad, 567—the late Sir Robert Peel, 568—suggests the substitution of bronze medals for prizes, *ib.*—labours of Royal Commissioners and the Executive Committee, 569-70—scantiness of funds to carry out the undertaking, 570—difficulties attending the selection of a site, 570-1—designs for the building, 571-2—Mr. Paxton plan accepted, 572—Mr. Paxton and M. Horeau, 572-3—Messrs Fox and Henderson, 574—Mr. Brassey, *ib.*—Messrs. Cubit, Kiss, and Fox, 574-5—extract from a paper written on the eve, and amid the bustle and preparation, of the opening, 576-7—superiority both in chasteness of decoration and economy of construction of the building in Hyde Park over that in Paris, 578—the *Morning Chronicle*, 579—Mr. Babbage on the question of having tickets priced, 579-80—the question of admitting exhibitors g.

tuitously, 580—season tickets, *ib.*—difficulties attending the assigning to each country its space, 581-2—and of classifying the articles exhibited, 582—use made of the political refugees now in this country, *ib.*—course adopted by the Executive Committee, 583—two great State federations formed, 583-4—the list of jurors, 584—not quite infallible, 584-5—appearance of the Great Exhibition on the day of opening, 585-6—numbers and occupations of its ordinary local population, 586-7—efforts made to guard against unforeseen contingencies, 587—table of receipts up to Sept. 25., 588—table of highest amounts of money taken, *ib.*—Chevalier Bunsen's suggestion to facilitate foreigners examining our national monuments and public buildings, 589—conduct of the Police, *ib.*—the two languages, War and Commerce, 589-90—future results of the Great Exhibition, 591—extract from a New York paper, 592—extract from Sir John Herschel, 592-3—science pre-eminently a peacemaker, 593—MM. Schönbein, Clausen, and Mr. Mercer, 594—amorphous phosphorus, 594-5—Professor Schrötter, Baron Liebig, and Mr. Young, 595-6—effect of the Exhibition upon trade and commerce, 596-7—love of order manifested by the people of England, *ib.*—general good results of the Exhibition, 597-8.

## P

*Penn*, Dixon's Life of. See *Dixon* (II. W.)

*Pulzky's Tales and Traditions of Hungary*, review of, 127-8—Hungary a borderland of mixed races, 129—the Magyars, 130—Pulzky's 'Jacobins in Hungary,' 131—his 'Yaaosh the Hero,' 132-5—'The Poor Tartar,' 136—races and outlaws, 137—propensity of the Hungarians to cattle-lifting, 138—the Hungarian exiles, 139.

## R

*Romans* (the) in Britain, review of works relating to, 177—reckless destruction of Romano-British remains, 178-9—Messrs. Collingwood, Bruce, Lee, Newmarch, and Professor Buckman, 180—publications by Messrs. Roach Smith, Robert Stuart, and Daniel Wilson, 181—vast amount of grain yielded by Britain to the Romans, 182—Caesar's first attempt on Britain, *ib.*—Britain during its connexion with the Romans, 182-3—Horsley's 'Britannia Romana,' 183—departure of the Roman legions, 184—Roman inscriptions, 185-6—mixed population of the Roman military stations, 186-7—mixed religious creeds, except Christianity, 188-90—gradual rise of the Roman towns, 190—tesselated pavements and pottery, 191—Bath the centre of the 'fashionable' part of Britain under the Romans, 192—Roman manufactures, 192-3—use of mineral coal by the Romans, 194—sites, and costs, of excavations, 195—Hadrian's Wall, 196—Housesteads, Chesters, Ribborough, and Reculver, 196-8—excavations at Portus Lemanis or Lymne, 199—fire a frequent agent of destruction of Roman villas in Britain, 200—this fact proved by excavations at Maryport, Ribchester, and elsewhere, 201—struggles between the Saxons and



Roman legions, 202—London a free-trading corporation after all towns had succumbed, 202—Sir F. Palgrave and Sir J. ~~Palgrave~~, 203—benefits derived from Roman laws and lawyers, (John), review of his 'Seven Lamps of Architecture,' and the Stones of Venice.' See *Sources of Expression in Architecture*.

## S

*Sources of Expression in Architecture*, review of works relating to, 365—requisites for an architect, and what architecture really is, 365—relation of expression to construction in architecture, 367—expression in architecture not yet appreciated, 369-72—expression in Egyptian architecture, 372-4—Mr. Ruskin's 'Venetian Architecture,' 375-8—expression in Greek architecture, 378—Greek decoration, 380-2—architectural colouring as practised by the Greeks, 382-3—Greek orders, 384—expression in Arabian architecture, 384-6—Arabian treatment of the arch, 387—expression in Lombard architecture, 388-90—Northern Pointed architecture, 390-2—defence of the Northern Gothic architecture, 392-4—'Aspiration' in Northern Gothic architecture, 395-6—detail of Northern Gothic Architecture, 397-8—Renaissance architecture, 399-401—concluding remarks, 402-3.

END OF VOL. XCIV.

LONDON:  
 GEORGE WOODS and SHAW,  
 NEW-STREET-SQUARE.









